BAPTIST REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. II. **APRIL, 1905.** **No. 2.**

THE BAPTIST POSITION FOR TODAY.

BY PROF. E. H. JOHNSON, D.D.

It is well for a man to know his place. It may not sound well to say so, for this may be taken as a hint that he is intruding into another man's place. Nevertheless it is well for a man to know his place. His place means his opportunity and his fitness. To have an opportunity and to find one's self fitted for it is the best that can fall to any man. It is what a man is for. It is well for a church to know her place. Against every church there is loud complaint that she has not found her place. "She has left undone the things she ought to have done, and she has done things which she ought not to have done, and there is no health in her," is all the cry. It is well for the sisterhood of churches to know their place. What the place is of the sisterhood of Baptist churches we are now to ask. That is, what is the Baptist opportunity and fitness, the Baptist message and mission, what, in a word, the Baptist position for today?

The opportunity is in part new, the fitness must be partly new. Unless our former position was essentially mistaken, it must remain for substance the same, but if it is to meet the demands of the changing times, its form must correspondingly change. In not a single particular will it remain unaffected. If I shall have the happiness to state correctly the present attitude of our denomination, some who are familiar with its former attitudes will inevitably feel that the new posture is strange or all but queer, even while they may concede that it is correctly stated. The former position is easily described. We hear it often, we read of it continually. Our fathers set

out with affirming the supreme and sole authority of the New Testament in matters of faith and practice. The New Testament seemed to them to teach that a church should be constituted of persons who give credible evidence of the new life. Such persons were to become members of the church through immersion in the name of the Trinity; being members, were to observe the memorial of our Lord's burial and rising; while as freemen in Christ they were to rule their own churches, and, for the sake of the completer self-rule, were to keep their churches independent. As a corollary to the spirituality of a church they held that it should concern itself only with spiritual things, while the state should confine itself to secular things. Thus they became the foremost advocates of full religious liberty.

To-day we begin with the authority of Christ. The fathers bowed to the authority of a book, we own the authority of a person. Not that they were less loyal to Christ, not that we defer less to the Bible, but that, in the order of thought the starting point has changed. It had to change. The many open questions about the Bible, even about the New Testament, forbid us to proceed as though these questions had not arisen. If we pay no regard to them, how can we meet the needs of a generation which is troubled about them? If we fail to consider them, how can we meet our own needs? But in what way shall we deal with these enigmas? Does anyone claim that the Baptist denomination has already taken them up and solved them? Or are we expecting a sisterhood of churches to pass upon them after a while? Will the venerable Philadelphia Association, or the energetic Pennsylvania Baptist State Mission Society, issue an answer to the problems of the higher criticism, or perhaps vote that these problems do not exist?

But what are we going to do? Is there nothing that can be done? Has all authority in religion been plucked from under our feet? Is no standard left upon which we can rely? Has the Bible lost all its conclusiveness for us if we do not set out with alleging its authority? Are we reduced to the plight of rationalists, and may properly believe only what we can reason out and argue up? This is what we will do: we will be loyal to Christ. We will ac-

cept his authority. We have in him the best which the Bible ever offered, or could offer, on whatever theory of inspiration. As to Christ we feel the strain of no real question. His ascendency is admitted. He is the supreme Teacher, whatever else he may be, and his teaching we find in the New Testament. His authority is generally accepted, and for us it is final. Never before was his supremacy so heartily, so widely known. Him we know. Him we bow to. If we maintain this attitude, as we are sure to. we have found our opportunity and our fitness; we know our place.

The situation, then, may be thus defined: our fathers believed in the New Testament because Christ gave it; we believe in the New Testament bcause it gives us Christ. They argue that he left to his closest disciples this and that pledge of infallible guidance into all the truth; but we, without argument, at once recognize our Lord. It might, to be sure, look like a mark of deference to Christ if we accepted the Book on the ground that he gave it to us; but only slight acquaintance with points at issue is needed to show that the question would then arise, What beyond dispute did Christ actually say? and on the heels of this would come the perhaps more staggering challenge, What saying of Christ was meant by him to guarantee the inspiration of the New Testament?

Yet, beyond question, the New Testament gives us Christ. He cannot be mistaken there. The representation of him is coherent and clear. And it is of one whom we personally know. Like the Magdalen, we hear him speak our name, and we know our Lord. He is also recognizably the Christ whom all generations of Christians have walked with, and trusted, and worshipped. His figure is perfectly well known, and never to be missed on the pages of the New Covenant. Whether we follow thoughtful Matthew or childlike Mark, the painstaking Luke or the intimate John, always we find the Master, and find him always the same. Every sketch shows a particular aspect, but the same face. The epistles do not change him. If we range through the fields of the wide-viewing Paul, or tarry with glowing Peter, if with eagle John we soar above earthly things, or walk with cautious James, who will have no mistake about anything, still we are with

Christ. In the gospels he is a personage, in the epistles he is an experience. It is now well nigh two thousand years that men have kept his company, and to all the generations he is the same personage and the same experience as to Matthew, Mark, Luke, Paul, Peter and John. In scouring the New Testament record criticism has not availed to intercept him, nor misunderstanding to disguise him; in the tumultuous course of history unbelief did not make out to hide, nor error to supplant, the real Christ. Again and again, at the hands alike of foes and friends, has the saying of the prophet come true, "His visage has been so marred more than any man," yet never beyond recognition. The Christ of history remains the Christ of the New Testament. But the New Testament has given him anew to every age of Christian history, and every age, of receiving him, has in turn accepted the New Testament. This ought to be in particular our own attitude toward the New Testament and toward Christ. Such an attitude is our denominational opportunity, and our denominational fitness.

Now and always it is the proper attitude, because the Christ of the Bible, of theology, of the church, and to-day the Christ of mankind, is an authoritative Christ. The Old Testament tells the story of the theocracy, but the New Testament proclaims the kingdom of heaven. That kingdom was announced by the forerunner, and preached by Jesus and his disciples. Of that kingdom he was to be the sovereign Ruler. Hebrews called him Messiah, their anointed king, and we call him Christ, still the king anointed to be over us. The ancient worthies mistook, it may be, the nature of his rulership, but not the fact of it. We, in turn, have been so engrossed with study and debate of his other offices as hardly to notice that the New Testament seats Christ upon a throne. Popular evangelical faith all but makes him abdicate the throne for the sake of exalting his priesthood. Because his kingdom is not of this world, it too easily escapes our notice that he has a kingdom. But he came from the right hand of God, and has returned with augmented authority. Now he must reign until he has put all enemies under his feet. That is to say, the New Testament presents Christ first and last, before all, after all and above all, as our sov-

ereign Lord. He was called Jesus, Savior, because he was to save his people from the disloyalty of sin.

Theology can make out no different relation between his offices. Too exclusive emphasis on one or another office has hitherto divided Christendom. To regard Christ as only a prophet makes men rationalists at most; to deal with him solely as priest sets them down as evangelicals at best; to overdo his kingship binds them hand and foot as high churchmen at worst. But his offices are interdependent, and in that interdependence the primacy belongs to the kingship. This office is as exalted in its intrinsic importance as in its outward dignity. A king is always above a prophet and more than a priest. As to be a patriarch was to be both prophet and priest, to speak for God and to offer sacrifice to God for one's household, so to be absolutely king is, in the essential idea of it, to embody the nation and fulfil all offices for them, to stand for them against the world and before God. As king Christ is more exalted than his functions of teaching and mediating could make him. He is prophet that he may declare the constitution and ordinances of his kingdom; he is priest that he may intervene between aliens and God and win them to God. Twice was he baptized into his royal office, once by John, again with that final baptism which he was so straitened to accomplish. Now he sends forth the Holy Spirit to make loyal subjects of all whom his teaching has availed to enlighten and his sacrifice to redeem. He is prophet and he is priest that he may be king, and for no other purpose which can be gathered from the nature and relations of his office, or from their fruition in the lives of his people. Supremacy is his prerogative, to rule is his right.

What both the Bible and the systematizing of Bible doctrine affirm history illustrates. The great churches which represent Christianity as a factor in human affairs, have set forth Christ as pre-eminently a king. His kingdom to them is his church, and obedience has been claimed as due primarily to the church because due ultimately to him. Practically this has issued in an assumption by the church of sole authority. The proper office of faith is said to be to believe the church. The faithful are those only who first of all put faith in the church.

Deferring to the church's prerogative they accept what she teaches and practice what she prescribes. They believe in Christ because she bids them do so, and in such wise as she bids. If this has amounted to spiritual bondage, a bondage as foreign to the gospel as that which Paul dreaded among the Galatians, and as unfriendly to real service of Christ as a Christian Pharisaism must needs be, all this is because a relation of Christians to the Kingdom has usurped the place of a relation between Christians and the King. The body is more esteemed than the Head, the society is put over its Lord, the organism preferred to the organific life. A proper relation is one of loyalty on the part of *the individual. The lordship of Christ, the loyalty of Christians* sets forth, as well as a formula may, what Baptists ought to stand for.

Such an attitude may be taken by any Christian denomination; historically we can claim it as our own. Two considerable and opposing bodies have always stood for authority in religion, the Roman church and the Baptist denomination. These two are bent on divine sanction for every doctrine and every rite which they accept. The Romanist bows to the delegated authority of the Church, the Baptist insists on original headship of the Bible. If now, without defection from the Bible, we would take a position impregnable to modern criticism, we must stand for the supremacy of the Lord Jesus, and stand firm. Any relaxation of loyalty would be a surrender. The best tempered weapons would fall from our nerveless hands. We have always felt that we could take orders from the Commander himself. Revelation has been for us an indispensable basis of religion. Ours is ever a "religion of authority" because it is "religion of the spirit." Between these is no antithesis. The spirit in the Bible is the spirit in those who wrote the Bible. The spirit in them is the spirit in us. Whatever its varieties, true religious experience is in species one. And so the spirit's teaching today reaffirms and confirms the teaching of the spirit at that day. In all days, if God but speak, and men but know his voice, it remains only to obey. To us Christ is the Word of God. His person embodies the

truth, his life sets it forth. What he is and what he does we find in the New Testament, whoever its writers were. When, therefore, we insist on the supremacy of Christ, we declare our independence of higher criticism both conservative and destructive. The disputes about authorship, mode of composition, or of compilation and editing, are of high moment, but not of the highest. We stand outside them, deeply interested spectators, but that is all. Our attitude involves a frank recognition of three facts: In the first place, the problems of criticism are too academic to be solved by any religious denomination; secondly, we do not need that they should be solved; thirdly, our unhesitating recognition of the Jesus of the New Testament as the historic Christ and the Christ of spiritual experience carries with it an almost irrisistible persuasion that the traditional claims of the New Testament are true. The documents which give so veracious an account of Christ cannot well be regarded as spurious or misleading.. Their credit, which depends on his, is well nigh as secure as his. Our loyalty to Christ is practically loyalty to the New Testament. The lordship of Christ and the loyalty of Christians furnish the starting point for Baptists in our day; what do they further involve?

Primarily and most obviously his precepts should be our rules of living. His commands are our laws. Loyalty is love for a law-giver. Loyalty to Christ is the love which he described when he said, "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me." That Christ makes a requirement is reason enough to a loyal heart for obedience. We may not see why such a requirement is made, but we do not doubt that it is properly made. We have no suspicion that there is any arbitrariness or capriciousness in our Lord's exactions; and so what he exacts we enjoy. Obedience to Christ is not legalism but liberty. Still, to be under law to Christ is felt to be for us the consummation of his mission alike for him and for us.

The next fruit of loyalty to Christ is that we accept him as the supreme criterion of truth. "The truth as it is in Jesus" is for us the consummate truth of religion. It was noticable that "he taught with authority." He

never hesitated to affirm anything which it fell to him to affirm. His assertion went to the outermost range of conceivable authority when he said, "No one knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." Revelation was completed in personal knowledge of Christ himself. He embodied more than he spoke, far more. It was quite in John's way to record that the invisible God was offered to human eyes in Christ. "He that hath seen me," said he to Philip, "hath seen the Father." So vital was this knowledge that we dare not affirm it in other words than his own, and hardly take in its purport even when couched in terms of his own choosing: "This is eternal life, to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou didst send." But as of his precepts so of his teachings we say that we may not always see how this or that can be true, yet we accept it as true. "At thy word I will let down the net," said Peter, and found that word could be trusted. This is the position of advantage and of fitness today. What Christ meant for teaching it belongs for Baptists to believe, and in turn to teach. From the torch in the Leader's hand we light our own and our neighbor's torch.

Yet submission to the law and acceptance of the doctrine of Christ does not compare with the stretch of loyalty shown in another way: we trust in him. Trust is the most entire subordination possible of one person to another. No act can be humbler, none more energetic, none more devoted. To trust indeed expects everything, but it gives over everything. It gets and it gives without reserve. It makes Christ ours, but it makes us his. Its gaining is in giving. It conquers by capitulation. Faith is a more primary loyalty than love. It works by love, and then love is transformed back into faith. At love's best faith is the furthest that love can go; at faith's fullest, love is the overflow of faith. When we commit ourselves entirely to Christ we entirely devote ourselves to him. To believe is to obey. "This is the work of God, that we believe on him whom he hath sent." To set forth Christ as the ruler of our lives, the standard of our beliefs, the object of our trust, is the mission and the message, the opportunity

and the fitness, in a word, the position for Baptists in our day.

But this threefold characterization of our Lord is possible because loyalty to him further requires us to hold the highest view of his person and of his work. To reduce the taking of human nature by the divine, in order to be rid of the miracle of it, into the last term of a process which pervades the cosmos may be for others to attempt, but not for us. Some may be embarrassed by the miraculous in the incarnation, we must know how to glory in it. Others may try to make faith easy by lowering the claims of Christ; for us faith is easy when we raise his claims. The experiment of letting down his pretentions in order to win adherents for him, has been tried many a time, and has often failed; but for us it is impossible because it is forbidden by loyalty. The newest theology of all, the Ritschlian, may seek to comfort the devout in spirit and despairing in doctrine by an assurance that it does not matter about doctrines, that one may get all Christ can give without asking himself what Christ is, or how he came by what he offers; but we at least have not learned how to leave the nature of our Lord in question; it cannot be worth as much in our judgment merely to call him Son of God, and let it go at that, not trying to find out whether he is more than Son of Man. We have no fitness, and can never find our opportunity, in any make-believe about our Lord. We must be loyal to the utmost in our thoughts of him, because we stand for his supremacy. If we do not know him as supreme, we do not know him at all; it is some one else than Christ whom we know.

As to his person, so as to his work: we must exalt this to the utmost. Loyalty requires it. In this way we act but as his immediate disciples learned to do. How they got their doctrine of his mission we are not told in detail. What we are told is this: so far as it involved his crucifixion they could not be made to accept it in advance; they held their Master at too high a rate; but the Holy Spirit was afterward to call to mind his sayings. When at length he did so their Master had taken his throne and they were ready loyally to set the highest estimate on all that he did or bore. With this disposi-

tion toward our Lord we too may be taught by the Spirit all that was taught to them.

But loyalty leads us not alone to glory in the cross; whatever is claimed for any work of our Lord, we also claim. If some cry "Back to Christ," we will go back to Christ; if others shout "Forward to Christ," we, too, will press forward to him. We believe in the Christ that was, and in the Christ who is to come. If any insist that everything turned on the incarnation, and can see nothing except what the incarnation in itself provided for, we will insist as stoutly as they on all which was gained when the "Word was made flesh, and men saw his glory"; or if the many refuse to glory save in the cross, we will not be outdone by the many in this glorying. Should others still declare with Paul that we escape condemnation not merely because Christ died, but rather because he rose again, we will look to the resurrection for as much of good as they do. Or if the resurrection itself is taken for a first step, which had to be followed by the ascension as a second step in order to make Christ our Intercessor and more than Intercessor, our present Life, even this conception of him, the ripest in the New Testament, and the latest to the common apprehension of Christians, we will let no one tell of in our hearing, even for the first time and as a new truth to us, without rejoicing in it and agreeing to it at once with all our hearts. It is seen to be a fresh claim for Christ which is supported by the experience and the teaching of the great saints in the apostolic age and every age. We can not let ourselves be anywise outdone in magnifying the work of our Lord.

Possibly we may outdo all others at resisting disparagement of some office for the sake of exalting another office. We cannot make the less of our Lord's incarnation for the sake of making the more of his cross, and we must not lower the cross in order to assess higher the value of the incarnation. We will never lay stress on his rising by withdrawing emphasis from his dying; nor, even for the sake of rating remission of sin as the purchase of his blood, can we let ourselves doubt that his resurrection helped to earn forgiveness for men. Nothing done by him on earth was so momentous that we dare

slight any longer what he now does for us; but, on the other hand, zeal for what may be to us relatively a new truth must not lead us to think slightingly of the resurrection as an occurrence, of the crucifixion as a mere fact, or of the incarnation as sheer reality. What Christ once was among men made sure of what he now is *in* men. Loyalty to him, as well as theological coherence, forbids us to belittle one of his offices in hope of magnifying the rest.

But to what end are these offices? What shall we announce that they have made ready for us to do? We would not bid men to attempt what God has already done, or has reserved for himself to do. That is, we cannot add to the Godward efficacy of the atonement. Can we then exhort men to be born of the Spirit, to be created anew in Christ Jesus? Should we summon them because dead in sins to rise to newness of life? Shall we call on them, as President Finney says he did, "to make themselves a new heart?" The supremacy of Christ suggests what we should say to our generation. Our message is no other than that to which we hold ourselves bound: "Obey Christ. Be loyal to Christ." Loyalty to him means not merely a new way of living, but a new principle of life. If, like Peter at the Gate Beautiful, we should tell men to "repent and be converted," the converting like the repenting must surely be from the centre outward. Our fathers had their attention fixed on this inward transformation; and, because it was so surely a transformation, their minds were taken up with the fact of change. They jealously argued for the newness of the new principle of life. They insisted that it must be new in order to be real. Any one's attempt to explain the nature of the change wrought by the Holy Spirit our fathers followed with critical intentness lest the explanation should undo the fact of a change. It if were explained as a change in the affections, they mostly insisted that, on the contrary, it must be a change in the nature. But others would not admit that the nature was capable of changing; to their minds regeneration could not be a change of nature, it must be the creation of a new nature. Yet even this fell short of the need which some thought they saw. Nothing less than a new life

must be produced, and this new life certain popular guides were prepared to cry up as no less than Christ himself in us, become our vital principle.

In a word, our fathers found themselves busied with the metaphysics of regeneration. They were so intent on making the most of the change that nothing short of a philosophy of the operations of the divine Spirit on human spirits could content them, and metaphysics claimed a place in their doctrine which, Bible-followers as they were, they would have been the foremost to decry in advance, and effectually to guard against, too, except through the process of insensibly drifting into it. Most intangibly metaphysical of all is any theory of a new life imparted by the Holy Spirit in connection with infant baptism.

The doctrine of the new birth is certainly one which has to be offered to our generation in a new form. It is for us who preach it to be occupied not so much with the nature of the change as with the aim and object of it. We cannot preach and the Scriptures did not, "Be born again.' We can say they need to be born again, and we can call on all men to be loyal to Christ. They will not become so unless they are transformed by the Holy Spirit, but this transforming is for the Holy Spirit, not for themselves, to effect. As when Jesus walked among men so now he bids them follow him. It is not necessary to enter with the unconverted into the question what the change is in regeneration, to expound synergism, monergism, or any other proposed account of this mystery. There are signs that already an idea has got about that birth from above is chiefly concerned with providing for a right ruling motive, imparting loyalty to Christ. The experiences of recent converts correspond to such an idea. We hear little about the burden of past sins, or hardness of heart, or struggle against besetting temptations, or about a penitent's despair and his deliverance. Converts seldom move us of late with the story of their painful conviction of guiltiness and their ecstatic delight when forgiven. We hear them say, "I thought it was time for me to turn to Christ. I felt that I ought to enlist on his side. I asked him to accept me. I believe he has, and now I desire to live for him." If asked whether

they have regarded themselves as sinners and trusted in Christ as their Savior, usually they will say yes, but it had not occurred to them to make a point of either the repentance or the faith. A specially intelligent young man thus summed up to me his religious experiences: "I expect to repent, I know I believe, and I wish to be baptized." At some future date he might take up the fact of past disobedience, now he was taken up with the thought of his present duty. So far he was like Saul of Tarsus. Saul, when the conviction smote him that he had made a mistake in persecuting Jesus, did not say he was sorry, did not confess a changed belief. No, he simply asked, "What shall I do, Lord?" Such a conversion may possibly be not the less radical because it looks forward rather than backward, or because the convert has not studied up the nature of the change. It is fairly certain that in these days our exhortations are surer of a hearing if we urge the object and aim of the renewing Spirit rather than try to open for inspection the process of renewal.

But some one will be ready with the challenge, Is not this to preach salvation by works? I reply, Does the Sermon on the Mount preach salvation by works? You ought to answer No. Why not Yes? Because the Lord does not there tell how to become a disciple, but what it is to be a disciple. He describes what his true follower must be and do, not how one may begin to be his true follower. And so to call on men to obey Christ, to be loyal to Christ, is to tell them what it is to be a Christian, not how to become a Christian. It is only just now that I have been insisting on the importance of estimating at its highest all that Christ did and does for us; the question now before us is, what all this can effect in us. It is meant to effect in us a transformation by the Spirit; but to our consciousness this operation of the Spirit can be no other than the conversion of our affections and of our lives. It is the Spirit which enables us to be loyal to Christ; but what we should summon men to is not the Spirit's work but our own.

No ground for questioning the reality of the new birth or its newness can be found in recent statistics which go to show that it is ordinarily associated with the trans-

ition from childhood to young manhood and womanhood. Neither science, philosphy, poetry, nor art is discredited by the fact that capacity for them shows itself at the same period, as is sagaciously remarked by Professor James in his "Varieties of Religious Experience.' If most people who turn to God at all do so as they cease to be children and before they become men and women, this is no recent discovery, and needed no carefully collated statistics to prove it. The churches of the majority have always recognized and acted on the fact. The Greek, the Roman, the Lutheran, the English churches with their "confirmation" service, the Presbyterians with their "children of the covenant," and the Methodists with their "probationers," indeed, almost all except a few Congregational bodies assume that the young of their flocks are to commit themselves formally to Christ and his church at the end of childhood. If we are not satisfied that all these youth are then regenerated, we have reason to believe that most of them who are ever regenerated are regenerated then. For ourselves, holding as steadfastly as ever that a church should be made up of those only who give good evidence that they have entered the new life, our mission is to make a proclamation of that life in terms not too theological to be appreciated. Let us, then, describe it as a life ruled by loyalty to Christ as Lord, through acceptance of Christ as Redeemer.

We may now and then wonder a little to find ourselves noticed not so much for insisting on the spirituality of the church as on scrupulous observance of its appointed forms. Our doctrine of the ordinances needs to be re-stated. Its substance is correct, its form is inapt. Of the need for restatement no sign could be plainer than the fact that the doctrine of baptism and communion is rarely heard from our pulpits, and more rarely welcomed. The ordinary position as to baptism is that believers ought to be baptized because Christ ordained it. Surely this is a good reason, and all the reason which can be looked for in a majority of young persons. But everyone baptised merely because it is required of him is a formalist. A formalist is no other than one who uses a rite without seeing any fitness in it or any reason

for it, beyond the fact that it has been appointed. If, to begin with, we can obey no better than formalists do, this is better than not to obey at all. But formalism is irksome. It is not congenial with the nature of Christianity. If no other reason is in mind for being baptized than that baptism is commanded, the question is bound to arise whether, after all,the ordinance is a necessary preliminary to church membership. Within a year or two American Baptists have been astounded to learn that certain of their pastors are ready, here as in England, to deny that necessity. Once openly said, this can never be unsaid. The denominational situation cannot again become just what it was before. All the world now knows of Baptists who maintain that Christ prescribed no other form of baptism than immersion, yet question whether he prescribed any baptism. How can this situation be met?

By showing that there is reason enough for being baptized in addition to the fact, and which explains the fact, that Christ commanded us to be baptized. It is a reason which loyality readily apprehends, and joyously embraces. We read descriptions of how a simple-hearted villager in the Bavarian mountains dares to take upon him the role of Jesus in a passion play, and to let himself be treated seemingly as Jesus was treated. It may strike us an an awful sacrilege. Yet every believer has the privilege once in his life of taking the part of his Master, of being for a moment laid out of sight and rising to light again, as his Lord was buried and rose. In the same way you declare what the Lord has done to you that in Christ you have died to the old life, and risen to the new life. Even more, you set forth what Christ has hereafter to accomplish. As the waters close above you so one day the earth must close, and as the waters part, so will the earth open that you may rise in the likeness of the Lord's resurrection. But this is all of Christianity. What Christ did for men, what he has done to every believer, what he will yet do for us, this sums up the special teachings of our religion. To profess faith in all this, to profess it so vividly, and to do it in the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, is a decisive committal of oneself to Christ and his service

before the face of the world. There will always be many whose loyalty to Christ will rejoice in such an opportunity, and who could by no means be persuaded to forego it. To begin in this way one's membership in the body of Christ may or may not seem to be commanded, but it is at least allowed, and, we may be sure, will never cease to make its appeal to faithful hearts that count it no shame to put on Christ before men, and would be glad, if it were possible, even to shame the shame that was his. As for ourselves, we will not cease to believe that baptism is required; but we can best recommend it to others as a loyal profession of Christ; and this we may take as the main reason for the requirement of it.

As to the Lord's Supper we used now and then to be bidden to look at it as but a memorial, yet, perhaps were oftener instructed to invite to it only members of our own churches. Strange and even sad that the purport of so affectionate a ceremonial should be at all lost to view in unamiable contention about who should participate in it. Of late we have heard but little on this head, and are likely to hear even less. But it is not possible to justify real neglect of what the communion signifies. We would mostly agree that it is suitable and seemly to observe a rite which means to begin, before a rite which means to continue the Christian life. This is all that is involved in the matter which it touches. And this is our whole doctrine as to terms of communion, in a nut shell. As in the case of baptism, if we would commend this ordinance we must learn to keep before people's minds not so much its ritual as its meaning, not precisely the rules for it but pre-eminently the spiritual realities in it. If, then, the Lord's Supper is a memorial of the Lord's dying, it is a memorial celebrated by treating it as food. By way of remembrance we newly accept our Savior. And then, as the communion is significant of union with him, it also of necessity signifies union with all who by the same means are united to him. Did you ever kneel by a loved one and unite your prayers? If there you both met Christ, did you not meet each other in Christ? And could it turn out otherwise if the communion brings us into union with him? Can the radii reach the center and stay apart? As Paul has it,

"We the many are one loaf." When this rite joins you to Christ, it joins you to every brother who sits there with you, and by the same means is joined to his Lord. More still, there and then you are united to everyone anywhere who ever did or ever will by the same act of piety reach him who is our Life. We may not sit together at church, but we sit together in Christ. What doctrines the far away brother holds or denies does not matter. At this point nothing matters except that both you and he are made fast to Christ by this reminder of him. How close is such communion? It is close as union with Christ. How open and wide is such communion? It is wide and open as faith. We Baptists have not claimed all that we are entitled to. If we are strict as to form, we are wide as the widest in spiritual reality, and the spiritual reality is what the ordinance is for. If we would be loyal to Christ, the spiritual reality appointed by him is what we ought by all means to bear in mind and urge. Our doctrine of the ordinances remains, but we shall present it better, when we show how it illustrates loyalty to Christ. We best commend baptism not so much by the command for it as by the meaning of it; we best commend the communion not by declaring its terms but by showing what it is for. And so once more the form is for the sake of the substance; and will any one tell why it should not be so?

Democratic church government and religious liberty build on the same fact, the lordship of Christ, and are maintained by the same principle, loyalty to Christ. It may be doubted whether there is a New Testament polity, but beyond doubt there is a New Testament principle of Christian association. Perhaps there was no uniformity in the functions of deacons, of elders, of overseers, also called bishops, or of congregations. At least, if uniformity existed, we cannot prove what it was. The function of the apostles themselves is not entirely clear. Even Paul, who would not admit that in anything he was "behind the chiefest apostles," and could "give a proof of Christ speaking in him," always tried to convince by argument, as though he had no authority whatever. Why, in the very epistle which insisted with violence that he did not owe his doctrine to any man, and might

venture to rebuke even Peter, he admitted that he obeyed a revelation in communicating to those who "were of reputation" the gospel he preached, "lest by any means he should run, or had run, in vain." But Paul left no doubt as to the principle which ought to rule the relations of believers: and this was such deference to the lordship of Christ as would forbid any brother to accept a master or to play the master. Furthermore, inasmuch as duty is to Christ alone and supreme, every servant of Christ must be "fully persuaded in his own mind" what his duty is. Paul but echoed the injunction of our Lord himself, "Be not called masters," and for the same reason, "One is your Master, even Christ."

Such a principle as this by establishing personal liberty would leave a church without any government whatever, if it were not that besides individual concerns there are common concerns. These latter, where all concerned are free and equal, can be managed only by common consent, or by a majority, if common consent is not to be attained, and if a decision must be had. Against the infringement of individual rights civil governments guard by constitutional or statutory provisions: but a church has to rely on the sense of justice and on fraternal feeling, whether the evil threatened is an invasion of individual rights by the church or a disregard of the church's peace by an individual. Congregational control of independent churches is the fundamentally correct polity, whatever modification may be adopted in practice without impairment of that loyalty to Christ which is the liberty of Christians.

Religious liberty in general has no other secure support except the lordship of Christ. I have never felt quite satisfied with the validity of the position familiarly taken by Baptists, that those who admit only converted persons to church membership could never be persecutors, because conversion is through faith, and faith is voluntary. Such a principle would, to be sure, forbid forcing any one into the church, but it would not forbid us to forbid the spread of false doctrine. There is nothing in voluntariness of church membership which must exclude the position of saintly Augustine that it is better to kill the body of a heretic than that he should kill

souls by spreading his heresy. But duty to Christ breaks every other bond. If I ought to obey him, I ought not to obey anyone else

This doctrine does not provide for precisely another position familiarly taken by us. We have claimed liberty from interference by the state, but have felt free to interfere indefinitely with our own church members. We have formulated confessions of faith and imposed covenants, meantime interpreting religious liberty as liberty for every brother who finds he does not entirely agree with us to step out of our fellowship. But the duty of every man to judge for himself as to the will of Christ extends to all *personal* opinions and practices. Individual liberty is guaranteed by the lordship of Christ, and its only bounds are those which loyalty prescribes. All diversity not traitorous is permissible. Our fathers faced their generation with the claim of liberty under the state; it is for us to face our own generation with the claim of *liberty under the church*. Christ is the only Lord whom we may acknowledge, loyalty to Christ the only law we can obey. "For freedom did Christ set us free; stand fast therefore."

The lordship of Christ appoints one supreme function to the church; namely, to make him Lord in the sphere which he has chosen. His kingdom is not of this world. The things of Caesar are not the things of God. It is the supreme office of the church to keep before men the importance of spiritual things. Attempts have not been wanting to provide through the church for temporal interests. Almost every reputable line of business has been run by churches in the hope of figuring as friendly to the poor. How far such an impression has been made on the world's poor others must be better able to report than I am. But this I may venture to say, that loyalty to Christ does not prescribe the conversion of all our churches into department stores which will provide every sort of goods at cost. It is not our mission to put an end to all merchantile profit and all private trade. We must at any rate leave to Philadelphians their Wanamaker and the stores which line Eighth street. No matter what success institutional churches could win, their trading function is not a function of loy-

alty to Christ, except so far as it is tributary and subsidiary to the spiritual ends of the Kingdom of God. While genius lends itself to preaching "another gospel which is not another," hearers in plenty will be there; but when the voice of genius is heard no more, it will be plain, if that voice was heard long enough, that spiritual men, plain men, teaching spiritual truth, have done nearly all the permanent good during that generation. For common-place ministers the choice is between "interpreting spiritual things to spiritual men" and whistling down the wind.

The nineteenth century was marked, the world over, and as much as anywhere our own country through, by a delirium of doctrinal fancies and freaks. These hundred years were a prolonged theological orgy. In the joyous freedom of speculation one enthusiastic group were ready to wipe out all substantive distinction between the human, or even the physical, and the divine. They would convert all things, including the soul of man, into activities of the Deity, until monism fairly became, as Spinoza was said to be, "God-intoxicated." At another extreme the Ritschlians, in despair of all mystic access to God, let theology sing into the slumbrous apathy of reaction, and denied all veritable knowledge of spiritual things. The strange frenzy of the nineteenth century it may be hoped, is wearing itself out. What shall bring it to a full end, and restore doctrinal sanity and health? As I passed a gang of men at work on a street railway, a large indolent negro lifted himself up and chanted to a weird, barbaric air these ear-splitting words: "I've spent all my money; I've been on a spree; I've been all over the world!" There was no rhyme and little rhythm in his song, but it was the completest poetical expression that I ever heard of the sense at once of futility and enlargement which are the very soul of drunkenness. The idle fellow had been on a spree no doubt, and we may take for granted that he had spent all his money; but while he staggered from grogshop to groggery, or reeled out of one street of the slums into another, very likely it seemed to him that he was going all over the world. How very big things must grow to the senses and the soul bewildered by

strong drink. There was no better cure for our dusky brother than the very thing that he was now doing, simply to work out of doors, in full air and under the shining sun. And so, for a generation drunken or drowsy with theological fancies, there is no radical cure except in work, loyal work out in the world, for the Lord Christ. If the church will do his will, she shall know his truth, as he himself said. If she will sow his spiritual things, he will doubtless provide for her all needed theological things. Christ is Lord, let us be loyal.

What was remarked at the outset may now be repeated: the Baptist denomination has not changed its doctrinal positions, and there is no sufficient reason for anticipating that it will do so; but it needs to present its tenets in ways as suitable to the present as its former ways were suitable to the past. In no case can its teachings be commended by timidity. What was remarked concerning the doctrine of Christ may be accepted as true of all Christian truth, high claims and a bold advocacy of them win assent, low views and half-hearted defence make a religion seem not worth defending. Modern weapons of precision do not dispense with the ancient courage.

It should be added that the representations of this paper do not claim to be applicable to any religion with which the writer is not particularly acquainted. The Northeast, and to some less degree, the Northwest, here and there, requires that familiar Baptist positions adapt themselves to a new situation. How far the South is yet exempt from invasion, not so much of new doctrines as a new attitude and sympathy toward doctrines, Southern observers must judge for themselves. They also alone can know whether they are sensible of any anxiety about the state of religious opinion and feeling, or whether they are ever troubled by a partly felt need of adapting their appeals and teachings to a new situation. But it is at least probable that wherever in these days men think about religion, similar problems will arise, similar strain be felt on mind and heart, and the very same need reveal itself that Christians should above all else and always be loyal to their Lord.

Crozer Theological Seminary.

AN EXPLANATION OF THE EARLY SUCCESS OF CALVINISM.

BY GEORGE CROSS, PH. D., TORONTO, CANADA.

Of the religious movements embraced in the Protestant Reformation, the most successful was that which bears the name of Calvin. Lutheranism prevailed in German territories and Scandinavia, but won to its religious views no other peoples, and even in its native Germany at certain great crises, it exhibited a lamentable weakness when confronted by a united papal church. Zwinglianism, more intellectual and biblical than Lutheranism and more ethical in spirit, spread over a part of Switzerland and of Southwestern Germany, but in reality did little more than prepare the way for a greater movement. Anabaptism, though the truest expression of the spirit of individualism, though in harmony with a great swelling tide of democratic sentiment, though profoundly religious and a re-embodiment of the love and martyr spirit of the ancient church, shrank from the dreaded contact with secularism and sank beneath the cruel stripes of intolerant foes. Anglicanism, supported by nationalism and the English love of political freedom, was lacking in religious depth and missionary zeal and secured a permanent footing on English soil alone. Calvinism, the creed of the little Swiss city of Geneva, soon outran them all. It absorbed the work of the Zwinglians; spreading into Germany it supplied to Protestantism there the stamina in which Lutherans had been so deficient; it gave rise to the mighty Huguenot movement in France ;it overran the Netherlands; gave the burghers strength to resist great Spain for a hundred years and created the Dutch Republic. Crossing the water it overthrew the royal power in Scotland and set up a church-state, based on Calvin's creed; it became a tremendous force in England even threatening to oust Episcopacy, and transplanting itself to the new world it contributed to the erection of the great republic.

While Calvinism may be properly regarded as an embodiment of the aggressive reforming spirit that was

in John Calvin and its immense influence explained as the impact of a mighty spirit upon its own age, I think a fuller explanation will result from an examination of the inner nature of the movement and of its relation to general conditions of the time. Calvin was peculiarly qualified to assume the leadership in Protestantism by his religious and moral principles, his cast of thought and his gift of statesmanship. Through these we can see how the system that goes by his name met the needs of the Europe of that day.

1. The religious and moral principles of Calvinism. Foremost among these is Calvin's *sense of God.* With him this overbears all other thought. Yet, for Calvin, God is not so much the Infinite and Ineffable, too far exalted for contact with man and matter; nor so much the gracious Father whose name is Love, as the Great Jehovah, whose personal will is the source of all real existence, all law and all good. The idea of absolute sovereignty was familiar to men of the Reformation time and to many of them not objectionable. The feudal ideas of correlated power and dependence as the foundation of government had by no means faded away. In England, France and Spain great, absolute monarchies laid a controlling hand on everything. The Holy Roman Empire still impressed men with the idea of one great central authority in the secular realm, and it was paralleled by the idea of a Holy Church at whose head sat the great spiritual monarch, the Pope. Notwithstanding influences subversive of the strength of these ideas, they still pervaded the popular imagination and constituted a natural stepping-stone to the idea of One Supreme. The idea of God so powerfully presented by Calvin took up these conceptions of authority, elevated them to a higher sphere and overshadowed them so that men in ever-increasing numbers conceived strength to resist, if ned be, such subordinate or usurped authorities in obedience to what they believed to be the will of the Absolute Monarch of Heaven and Earth.

Connected with this sense of the majesty of God, the Omnipotent Will, is Calvin's *reverence for an absolutely valid moral law.* The declared will of God is law for men. Moral principles thus rest on an immovable foun-

dation and admit of no exception. They come to us with an authority which man is incompetent to question and which, in its very nature, can make no compromise with disobedience. An awakened moral consciousness, doubting or renouncing traditional authority in morals and willing to rest in the utterances of the moral reason, found a powerful attraction in this doctrine. It condemned the temporizing of Rome. It annulled the distinction between mortal and venial sins. It abrogated the authority of canon law. It made all violation of right an insult to God. Neither Lutherans nor Anabaptists had presented God as Lawgiver and man as absolutely his servant in this clear and emphatic manner. Consequently, in many quarters, the Reformation, with its renunciation of the authority of the Church and its appeal to faith and love, had seemingly opened the floodgates of immorality to many who had rejected the Judaism of Rome, but were still too pagan in spirit to abandon her paganism. Calvinism dammed back this current by its stern insistence on an unalterable moral code and more than others justified on this ground its protest against Rome. Calvin's writings are pervaded throughout with *a conviction of the sinfulness of men.* There are times when a reader feels that his nickname, "the Accusation," given by his college-mates, must have been appropriate, for he has almost a fondness for dilating on human sin. But, after all, this emphasis on depravity was on outcome of his reverence for God and his knowledge of the wickedness and immorality then abounding. Calvin had experienced a revulsion against all turpitude. Moreover he was a close student of the Prophets, Paul and Augustine. The latter's view of mankind as a *massa perditionis* had deeply impressed him. Heart and eye corroborated the testimony of the ancient theologian. Moreover at an earlier time the Catholic church had given the same witness. Some of the effects of this teaching appear in movements of thought both within and without the church, which show that the sense of guilt lay heavy on many a human heart in the Reformation days. The Papal church had exploited this sense of sin in the interests of ecclesiasticism and as a result the consciences of men were being prostituted

The popularity of the sale of indulgences proves this. It was natural then that Calvin's thunder against sin, his treatment of sin as a crime and his condemnation of the whole corrupt papel machinery found an echo in the more earnest and serious-minded souls everywhere. Granted his doctrine of sin, the impossibility of salvation through the church's ministrations followed. A corupt church trifling with the spiritual needs of the world appeared as very anti-Christ.

But this negative support of Calvin's views found its positive counterpart in his *certainty of the divine favor.* Whether or not the theoretical basis which he used as a support to this religious conviction will stand the test of criticism, there can be no doubt that herein Calvin gave a welcome response to a common need. The Church of Rome maintains its hold on its adherents partly by keping them in continued uncertainty of their future happiness, and consequently in constant dependence on the ministrations of the church and the completeness of their own compliance with her demands. At that time multitudes had lost their confidence in the church and yet, being unable to enter into the half-mystical experiences of Luther or the Anabaptists, were still floundering in confusion. Human action and human experience are so fitful that no abiding confidence can spring from these alone. Calvin directed men to the unalterable decrees of the divine will and the fixed purpose of God to save, and thus lifted the future destiny of men above all contingency. Here at last was firm standing-ground for those who were able to receive it, and with the shout, "If God is for us, who can be against us?" they triumphed over Catholicism.

2. Thus far of Calvinism as religion. But Calvin was more than believer; he was also thinker. In fact, his system of thought rather than his religious attitude has become traditional. We turn then to the *characteristics* of the Calvinistic system of thought.

We remark at the outset the *inclusiveness of Calvin's theology.* His combinative power was phenomenal. Elements most diverse from sources most diverse were welded together by the mighty hammer of his intellect and presented as a system. The Catholic, the Rationalist,

the Biblicist and the Mystic have all their place. Tradition, logic, written statute and Christian consciousness add each its quota. No radical in theology was he. No attempt was made to reconstruct Christian doctrine from the first, for the old Catholic doctrine was retained and vindicated by him. On the question of the Trinity and the divine-human Christ, he was in perfect accord with the Athanasian creed, though no stickler for set terms. In regard to original sin, atonement, regeneration, predestination and the sacraments, he could quote approvingly from the Fathers. He never disputed the historical continuity of the church, as did the Anabaptists, and thus he drew to Protestantism many who, though anti-Papal, were Catholic. The humanist, the friend of the Renaissance found a friend in Calvin. Unlike Luther, he never indulged in expressions of contempt for Reason. He acknowledges its functions for discovery in his natural proofs of the existence and attributes of God and its corroborative testimony to the divine origin of the Scriptures. His translations and expositions of Scripture and his derivation of doctrine from the Bible would satisfy the most ardent biblicist of the time. Even mysticism finds a place in his system, where, e. g., he acknowledges that knowledge of God and self-knowledge are mutually involved and where he acknowldges the unimpeachable inner testimony of the Spirit to the truth of Scripture.

He organized Protestant thought and gave it body. Luther, while more original and profound than Calvin in many of his utterances, spoke rather with the fervor of the prophet. He was no systematizer. He was clear and emphatic in his doctrine of justification by faith and his negative views of Catholicism were well known, but there was lack of coherency in his more positive views. The Anabaptists' love of freedom, their emphasis on spirit, character and conduct rather than doctrine as expressing true Christianity, held them back from a reasoned and rounded system of teaching. It was plain that if Protestantism was to succeed, it must have a positive, distinct message that would appeal to intelligence. It needed a well-understood battle-cry. This it received from Calvin. He gave to the world a Protestant dog-

matic markedly opposed to Romanism. Henceforth Protestantism stood for definite doctrines and compelled Roman Catholicism to be definite too. Moreover, his whole system appeared as the harmonious utterance of authoritative Scripture and it vindicated Protestantism against the Roman Catholic contention that confusion and contradiction were the inevitable consequences of a renunciation of the authority of the church. To be sure Calvin was no friend to sectarianism. He was intolerant of teachings opposed to his view, as witness his severity toward the long-suffering and much-persecuted Anabaptists and his execution of Servetus, but in this he was not so much the bigoted sectarian as the stern legislator who thought he was upholding the authority of revelation against the wantonness of sinners. That he justified his action by an appeal to the Old Testament was the result of his extreme Protestant biblicism. How much soever we may lament the awful mistake he made in enforcing his views upon unwilling men, this very thoroughness, this severe repression of opposition, this determination to establish by law a unitary system of morality and doctrine was more in harmony with the spirit of an age that had been trained in submission to authority, upheld by force and that felt the dangers of absolute liberty, than were the liberal views of the Anabaptists.

This suggests a third characteristic of Calvin's theology—perhaps to be expected in one who had been trained for the bar—*his legal habit of mind.* To him the Bible was a divine law-book. Its teachings were the statutes of the Supreme Lawgiver. He made it the Protestant text-book on morals, religion, doctrine, church order and even political institutions. The same characteristics appear in some of his outstanding doctrines. The divine decrees antedate all history. Salvation and condemnation flow from God's election and reprobation, and all human conduct is the outcome of the same unchanging law. The atonement of Christ is a legal transaction and so is the Justification of believers. To many of the present day this is a stumbling block in Calvin's system, but it was much less so in his day. The temper of the age was legal. Europe's inheritance of old Rome's ideas, the growth of monarchial power in the period im-

mediately preceding the Reformation with the accompanying tendency toward the unfolding unitary systems of law and, most of all, the evolution of papal machinery, the administration of papal government, the growth of canon law with the inevitable result that jurisprudence became the chief study of ecclesiastics, combined in stamping upon the Catholic world the legal complexion of thought. Protestantism in Calvinism appeared clothed with the highest claim to divine legality and satisfied the consciences of men who sought the right to break away from the Roman church, but as yet had scarcely dared to denounce her as an organized rebellion against the authority of High Heaven.

3. Calvin was far from being a mere theorist. He put his theories into practice with great success. He rendered to Protestantism the *services of a great statesman.* In the government of Geneva he presented a system that honored religion by recognizing it as supreme in the state and that maintained the character of a good secular government also. Thus far Protestantism had failed to give both to religion and civil government their dues and in this respect had appeared inferior to Catholicism. The Roman Catholic Church had professedly established the right of religion to supremacy on earth. But it had acknowledged the divine origin of civil government also. These were stated as the soul and the body in man. Despite great conflicts between the church and several of the states of Europe, this theory proved fairly workable. The church stood for law and order. It had upheld civil governments in return for the subserviency of civil rulers to the church's aims. In this regard Protestantism was at a disadvantage. In Anglicanism and Lutheranism it subordinated the church to the state by treating religion as a function of civil government. In neither of these forms of Protestantism did the church enjoy self-government. Under such conditions religion was bound to be a plant of sickly growth and it is no wonder if to many intelligent men of evangelical temper the Catholic church, with all its failings, was preferable to such politico-religious establishments.

On the other hand, Anabaptism seemed even more objectionable. Its implications were, apparently, the over-

turning of all authority, both ecclesiastical and secular. Rejecting realism, the Anabaptists had discredited the career of the Great Church by regarding it as the history of a fatal lapse from primitive Christianity. To a world just beginning to be free, they semed equally to threaten the stability of every known form of secular government. The Peasants' war and the Münster uproar seemed to warrant such fears. Monarchy and Aristocracy saw their very existence threatened by the rise of dread democracy. The suspicion grew that Protestantism was ultimately destructive in character. On the one hand it threatened the church, on the other the state.

It was reserved for Calvin to free the Reformation from such a charge. The system he established in Geneva falls far short of more modern conceptions of the rights and mutual relations of religion and civil government, but it proved to men of his time that Protestantism did not spell *anarchy*. It was a church-state, rather than a state-church and thus was free from the reproach which Catholicism flung at Anglicism and Lutheranism. It recognized the peculiar, divinely-allotted sphere of civil government and this washed out the stain of Anabaptism. Without being anti-monarchial (for Calvin was virtual king in Geneva,) it combined aristocracy and democracy and thus attracted sympathy from all sides. Moreover, it possessed stability. During those troublous times it not only presented the spectacle of a well ordered city government in which lawlessness and moral looseness of all sorts were sternly put down, not only a state from which Anabaptist and other disturbing opinions were banished and the ancient Catholic faith firmly maintained, not only a city of refuge to which the persecuted of a like faith from other lands might flee, but it also demonstrated its ability to preserve its territory inviolate, notwithstanding the ill-will of its enemies. Calvin proved to the world of his time that Protestantism was workable, and thus he provided a rallying-center of positive Protestantism that was to force its way onward in spite of all opposition. Perhaps Calvin's greatest achievement was: he organized Protestantism and enabled it to contest successfully with Roman Catholicism the supremacy of Europe.

THE SCOTTISH CHURCH CASE.

BY THE REV. JAMES ORR, D. D., GLASGOW.

The 31st of October, 1900, was a red-letter day in Scotland, for then was accomplished the union, long laboured and prayed for, of the Free Church of Scotland and the United Presbyterian Church—the two great sections of non-established Presbyterianism in that country. The event was of national significance. The Free Church represented, in Lowlands and Highlands, about 300,000 communicants, and the United Presbyterians about 200,000—in all about half a million, or, with adherents, nearly a third of the total population. The union was hailed with acclamation by practically all Christendom as a signal triumph of Christian principle and right feeling in the subordination of minor differences and ecclesiastical prejudices to the great cause of unity in the Lord's work.

Few foresaw in what trouble this happy event was soon to land the United Church. On August 1st, 1904, a decision was given in the British House of Lords which had the effect of transferring the whole of the property of the Free Church section in this union—the entire invested funds, colleges, halls, offices, churches, mission premises throughout the world, of this vast organization of 300,000 members—to a small handful of people, chiefly in outlying Highland places, represented by some 27 ministers, who had protested against the union, and refused to enter into it. These, the Law Lords, who heard the case—seven in all—by a majority of five to two, declared to "lawfully represent the said Free Church of Scotland," and to be "entitled to have the whole of the said lands, property, and funds applied according to the terms of the trusts upon which they are respectively held for behoof of themselves and those so adhering to and associated with them, and their successors, as constituting the true and lawful Free Church of Scotland;" while of the main body, it is declared that "the said United Free Church of Scotland has no right, title, or in-

terest in any part of the said lands, property, or funds."

This astounding decision, based, as will be seen after, on the flimsiest of technical grounds, and on positive error as to facts—what bench of English judges ever *could* be expected to understand Scotch ecclesiastical questions?—came like a thunderbolt. It was, in its magnitude and ruthlessness, absolutely without precedent in Scotland, since the days of the persecutions of the Covenanters, and was so manifestly out of all relation with the actualities, not to say equities, of the case, that people could only stand aghast, or indignantly ejaculate "Monstrous!"

What made this decision the harder to bear was that it was the reversal of the judgment which had been come to unanimously by the highest Scottish legal tribunal—the Court of Sessions—and, further, that, in a *first* hearing in the House of Lords, the judges being equally divided, the decision would have been given, according to practice in such cases, in favor of the United Free Church, but for the lamented death of Lord Shand, which upset the balance, and led to the *second* hearing, with the result above noted. Of the twelve legal minds that, in the lower and higher courts, applied themselves to the case, seven (including the four Court of Session judges), gave a decision in favor of the United Free Church and five against it. The minority in the last hearing consisted of Lord Lindley and Lord MacNaghten, recognized as two of the ablest legal authorities on the bench. It is an unpleasant reflection that a church should be put in this absolute way (with respect to its total possessions), at the mercy of an accidentally composed group of men, when the slightest contingency might have led to an entirely different grouping and a different result.

What are the grounds on which this amazing judgment was based? Or how did it come about? To explain this, a little must be said first on the history of the churches entering into the union.

The Free Church of Scotland, it is well known, took its origin at the "Disruption" from the Established Church in 1843, as the result of conflicts with the civil courts on Patronage and Spiritual Independence. The Evangeli-

cal Revival had led to a great increase of life in the Established Church, and the Evangelical party, headed by Thomas Chalmers, had sought to nullify the worst effects of patronage and to popularize the constitution of the church by passing a "Veto Act," giving a right to heads of families to veto an unpopular presentee, and a Chapel Act, granting full status to ministers of *quoad sacra* parishes (new parishes created out of the old legal parishes). Collisions with the law courts ensued, and a series of decisions in the Scotch Court of Session, confirmed by the House of Lords, declared that the church had exceeded its powers in these acts, and had in fact no jurisdiction save what it derived from acts of Parliament—its actions being subject to review and reversal by the civil courts. All means of redress failing, some 451 ministers, with a large body of the Scottish people, left the State Church, and constituted themselves into the Free Church of Scotland. The Disruption Church had enormous difficulties to contend with, but, sustained by the consciousness of a great cause, it surmounted these, and built up the splendid heritage it took with it into the union.

The United Presbyterian Church—not to be confused with the excellent donomination of that name in the United States—was in its origin much older. It was formed in 1847 by the union of what were known as the Secession and the Relief Churches in Scotland—the former going back to 1733, when four brethren, with Ebenezer Erskine as chief, "seceded" from the Established Church in defence of evangelical principles and the rights of the Christian people, put in jeopardy by the prevailing party; the latter to 1752, when the Rev. Thomas Gillespie was deposed for refusal to take part in a forced settlement of a minister. The Secession Church, after a long split on the subject of a largess oath, had become re-united in 1820, and in both its sections had advanced to what are called "voluntary" views on the relations of church and state: that is, the prevailing sentiment had come to be that unions of church and state were not only inexpedient, but unscriptural. The Relief Church held the same views. The Free Church, on the other hand, had just come out from the Establishment and

the majority of its people had at first no objection to Establishment in itself, provided their liberties as a church could have been secured under it. This, however, had proved unattainable, and Establishment, in the opinion of most, had been left behind forever.

It was inevitable that two large churches of this kind, both outside the Establishment, existing side by side in the same country, holding the same standard of doctrine, one in government, doing the same work, seeking the same ends, in practice fraternizing and co-operating in a multitude of ways, should think of union. No duty seemed clearer, and negotiations for union were hopefully opened in 1863. These, however, enthusiastic in their commencement, had, after ten years, sorrowfully to be abandoned, owing to the persistent opposition of a minority in the Free Church, headed by Dr. Begg, who held that the "Establishment principle" was an essential part of the Free Church constitution, and opposed union with "Voluntaries." The dread of a serious split, with legal proceedings following, stayed the negotiations, and the fathers in both churches, who had thrown themselves heart and soul into the movement, "died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them, and greeted them from afar."

Thus matters stood till 1896, when, under pressure of practical needs, proposals for union were renewed, and the negotiations began which issued in the happy union of 1900. Meanwhile, both the United Presbyterian Church (1879) and the Free Church (1892) had passed "Declaratory Acts," giving explanations on various points in the Westminster Confession of Faith, and putting in the forefront of their testimony the love of God to the world, and gift of his Son for the salvation of mankind.

It has been stated that a minority of 27 ministers stood out against the union of 1900. The voting in the assembly in October 1900, was 643 for union and 27 against. The vote at the assembly (a representative body) includes elders. To this small fraction the opposition had reduced itself and it was not to be expected that the church would refrain from a great and manifest act of Christian duty because of the scruples of so few. But, though few, and

to our view, unreasonable, narrow and obstinate in their opposition, the minority were sufficiently determined, and, having constituted themselves the "Free Church of Scotland," within a few weeks commenced a process in law to have the whole property transferred to them. The United Church has been widely blamed by those who have taken their cue too readily from unfriendly newspapers, for their "harsh treatment" of the minority. We are persuaded it could be shown to any unprejudiced mind that there is no real ground for this accusation. We write with knowledge when we say that there was never the slightest desire to bear hardly on the minority, with some of whom, at least, the church parted with genuine regret. The United Church could not, of course, acquiesce in, or countenance in any way, the claim of this fraction to be the true and sole representatives of the Free Church of 1843, entitled to all its funds and properties; nor was it in its power, lawfully, even had it been willing, to divest itself of a portion of these (trust) funds and properties of the church, and hand them over to the minority who had left. It was well known that the programme of the leaders of the party was "all or nothing;" and, in truth, before anything could be done, the legal thunderbolt was launched. There was, however, we can say with assurance, the strongest desire, even then, to deal generously with the ministers of the minority as respects their personal interests; no one who had a congregation adhering to him would have been molested in church or manse; means would have been found to meet equitable claims; at the very outset directions were sent to all ministers in the Highlands to grant joint-occupation to dissentients, even where they were in a minority. It became necessary, after the action was raised, to test the powers of the church under what is called the Model Trust Deed, by taking a few cases under that Deed into court; but there was no actual disturbance of any one by the church authorities. It has been very different with the smaller body who, since their victory in the House of Lords, have ruthlessly used the weapon put into their hands, by interdicts and otherwise, to obtain sole possession of churches, manses, and buildings, even where the United Church is largely in

the majority.

The grounds on which judgment was sought and obtained in the House of Lords—to come now to that vital point—were mainly two: 1. That the Free Church, in entering the union of 1900, had departed from the "Establishment principle," held to be an essential part of its constitution, and 2. That in its statements in the Declaratory Act on the love of God to the world and responsibility of all men under the gospel, it had departed from the doctrine of the Confession, and had become "Arminian." A wider issue, which we may call 3, was, whether the church has within itself power to alter its constitution or revise its doctrinal standards. On the first of the above points, the five Lords in the majority, were emphatic that the "Establishment principle" was an integral part of the constitution of the Free Church, which had been violated by the union; on the second, the Lord Chancellor took up an equally strong position, adverse to the church, and two other judges agreed with him, while another did not give an opinion and one was doubtful; on the third, all five judges were agreed that the church had not power to revise its doctrinal formularies. The two Lords in the minority declined to follow their colleagues in these views, which, as they saw, reduced the spiritual power of the church to a nullity. To Lord MacNaghton "the real and only question" was: "Was the Free Church, by the very condition of her existence, forced to cling to her subordinate standard with so desperate a grip that she had lost hold and touch of the supreme Standard of her faith? Was she from birth incapable of all growth and development? Was she, in a word, a dead branch, and not a living church?"

At the basis of the judgment of the House of Lords was the idea of the church as a Commercial Trust. The law, it was held, could take no cognizance of a thing called a "church;" it knew only of an "association," constituted for trust purposes, and existing to administer property in terms of the articles of the original agreement. The theory was that there had been a trust formed in 1843 on the basis of a "prospectus" (found chiefly in the moderator's address of Dr. Chalmers) in which the "Establishment principle" was put forth as

essential; and that on this basis the funds had been contributed which the church afterwards existed to administer. The Free Church, on the other hand, contended that it was not thus it had ever understood its own constitution; that to treat the Church as amere trust, ruled by the "dead hand," was to deny its character as a living church of Christ, with inherent powers to regulate its own affairs, confess its faith, and revise its formularies, under sole responsibility to him; it denied that the "Establishment principle" was ever regarded as an essential part of its constitution; and it warmly repudiated the Lord Chancellor's interpretation of its theology as an outrage on its actual belief! The trust of the church was its *work,* for the sake of which, as time went on, its funds had been contributed, and in the carrying on of which they had been faithfully applied.

It will be convenient to dispose of the doctrinal question first. The Westminster Confession affirms in terms which many who are Calvinistic at heart think objectionably strong, the doctrine of predestination; but, together with this, it affirms the natural freedom and responsibility of man, and the duty of men to repent and believe. Historically, the Free Church never swerved in its proclamation of a free and full gospel; no one preached such a gospel more energetically than Dr. Chalmers. On behalf of the minority, however, it was contended that the declaration of a free gospel to men, and of the responsibility of men under the gospel, contradicted the Confession, and the conclusion was drawn, not that the Confessions should be changed, but that the church should be disinherited for having included these statements in its Declaratory Acts. It is hardly credible that any one professing to represent the Free Church should take up this ground, but so it was.

The passage in the Declaratory Act specially objected to was the following: "This church most earnestly proclaims, as standing in the forefront of the revelation of grace, the love of God—Father, Son and Holy Spirit—to sinners of mankind, manifested especially in the Father's gift of the Son to offer himself a Propitiation for sin, and in the striving of the Holy Spirit with men to bring them to repentance. That this church also holds

that all who hear the gospel are warranted and required to believe to the saving of their souls; and that, in the case of such as do not believe, but perish in their sins, the issue is due to their own rejection of the gospel call. That this church does not teach, and does not regard the Confession as teaching, the foreordination of men to death irrespective of their own sin."

To these paragraphs the strongest objection was taken in the course of the debate. Counsel (Mr. Johnson) was asked, "Do you complain of this and say they had no right?" Reply: "I do." Asked: "This is one of the Acts you complain of?" Reply: "This is the Act I complain of." The Lord Chancellor insisted upon it that the Free Church was precluded by its Confession from admitting free-will, or preaching a free gospel. Here is one gem of theology from Lord James of Hereford. The Dean of Faculty had quoted the passages in the Confession on the duty of repentance, and its declaration that by repentance and faith the sinner may be saved. Lord James asks: "But may not that be applied to those who are not predestined?" his idea being that predestination dispenses with the necessity of repentance and faith.

This, then, is the extraordinary position in which the minority has been placed by the arguments of their own counsel, and by the decision of the Lord Chancellor and those concurring with him: They are bound forever unchangeably to the letter of the Confession; they are debarred from preaching a free gospel; they are forbidden to teach that men are responsible under the gospel; they are bound to hold that man has *not* free-will, and that men are foreordained to death irrespective of their sins. Individuals have been endeavoring ever since to show that they are not committed to these views, but what avails it, when this was their own plea, on the basis of which, in part, the decision was obtained? In other utterances, they admit the whole. One "leader," e. g., has been expounding that the real crime of the church is that it teaches that men incur condemnation by rejecting Christ. "Sinners," he declares, "are not condemned for rejecting Christ; but their rejection of Christ is the evidence and fruit of their being lost." For such sins the church is to be stripped of its worldly all!

The main leg of the House of Lords' decision, however, is undoubtedly the so-called "Establishment principle;" but on this point, also, it is easy to show that the English judges were entirely astray in their facts. It is the case—no one denies it—that the Disruption fathers did not separate from the state from any objections to Establishments *per se.* The Disruption documents—the "Claim of Right" and "Protest"—make this perfectly clear. They would at the time gladly have retained their Establishment status had it been secured on what they conceived to be right principle. But it is equally certain that once the decisive step had been taken of leaving the Establishment, they turned their backs forever—or the great majority of them did—on the idea of ever returning to it; it became to them, as they were wont to say, a mere "theoretical" opinion, applicable, perhaps, to the millennium, but of no present practical importance. They took pains to make it clear that they did not desire to bind their successors to this position—the new formula of 1846, e. g., expressly pledges office-bearers to the acceptance *only* of "the general principles" embodied in the claim and protest, "with respect to the spirituality and freedom of the church of Christ, and her subjection to him as her only Head, and to his word as her only standard"—and they turned their faces from the beginning towards union with their Dissenting brethren. The proof of this is overwhelming, and may be gathered from the utterances of Chalmers, Guthrie, Cunningham, Candlish, Buchanan and most who were, or came to be, regarded as leaders. We have only room for one or two specimens, but they will probably suffice. Addressing a great meeting in commemoration of the bi-centenary of the Westminster Assembly at Edinburgh, in July, 1843, (within two months of the Disruption) Dr. Chalmers took exception to a motto which some had fathered on himself—"Co-operation without incorporation" (i. e. with Dissenters,) and said:

"Therefore, without saying roundly and universally, 'co-operation without incorporation,' . . . .I would substitute for these words, 'co-operation now, and this with the view, as soon as may be, to incorporation after-

wards.' " He asked why, in the name of common sense, two parties should suspend their duty, common to both, because they chose to differ in opinion respecting the duty of a third party (the State) who has no connection with either of them; and went on to say:

"We assuredly stand as hopelessly dissevered from the party in question, and have as little hope of being restored to a connection with them, as if there had sprung up betwixt us an immovable wall of brass 1,000 cubits high. . . . . so that the question now resolves itself into this, will there, or will there not, be religious establishments in the days of the millennium? To me, at least, it seems the clear path both of wisdom and duty, just to leave that question for the millennium itself to settle when the millennium comes; and meanwhile, do all we can to speed forward those millennial days."

The next example will interest Americans. Dr. Wm. Cunningham was sent in 1843 to America to plead the cause of the Free Church, and expound its principles. Before extending help, however, the American churches desired to know the position of the Free Church on the connection of church and state. In answer Dr. Cunningham wrote that "the question of national establishments is, with the views and in the circumstances of the Free Church, a purely theoretical one," and declared that the improbability of re-establishment "was so great as practically to amount in our judgment, to an impossibility." On this express ground, as the American (New Jersey) minute shows, many thousands of pounds were contributed. On Dr. Cunningham's return he gave a report of his mission to the Assembly (1844), in which he said:

"I find a very general admission of the great scriptural principle for which we contend, that in virtue of the principles embodied in God's Word the obligation is laid on rulers and nations to have regard to the moral government of God as supreme and to the welfare of the Church of Christ. The general admission of this doctrine is all we care about."

Of course, *on this point* there was no divergence of view (as the later "Articles of Agreement" show) be-

tween the Free Church and the Voluntary United Presbyterian Church.

Only one other testimony may be given. The Claim of Right and Protest were drafted by Mr. Murray Dunlap. This gentleman has left his emphatic witness to the meaning of these documents. "That term ('establishment principle')," he said, "in no way described the principles for which this church contended."

"It was a result in certain circumstances which they thought lawful, that the State should endow a Church; but as to considering their principle as in any degree necessarily connected with the establishment of the Church, nothing could be further from their view, and nothing could give a more false notion of their principles than by so representing them."

The sheet-anchor of the judges in the House of Lords was the moderator's address of Dr. Chalmers at the Disruption assembly, in the course of which he declared, "We are not voluntaries" (which everybody knows). This address, it was held, being ordered to be printed and circulated, was an authoritative document on the constitution of the church—the "prospectus" of the Free Church. In point of fact, the address was printed only as part of the whole proceedings, just as was done in many succeeding years; but the Church in ordering a moderator's address to be printed never dreams of committing itself to every clause of it, or regards it as part of its constitution! In this particular case, Dr. Chalmers' remark gave not a little offence, and he publicly explained within 48 hours after that his meaning had been quite misapprehended. But to the English Lords, who, as their questions in the case showed, were in blissful ignorance of the most elementary facts as to the nature and procedure of a Scotch General Assembly, the order to print was sufficient to erect the address into a fundamental constitutional charter of the Free Church!

As respects the period subsequent to the Disruption, it could not be denied that the feeling against State Establishments constantly grew and strengthened in the Free Church—the strongest protests being year by year made against the continuance of the existing establish-

ment, and demands being formulated for full religious equality. The "Establishment principle," in short, had no more to do with the actual life and work of the Free Church from the hour of the Disruption, than if it had belonged to the politics of the moon! Yet the decision rests on the idea that the Church was a trust company, expressly constituted to float this particular "principle," and unalterably bound to it! It is safe to say that a greater travesty of facts, with more serious consequences, has never been known in history.

Another point on which the Lords went seriously astray was in the assumption that the funds and property of the Free Church had been created in 1843—at the commencement of the history of the Church—on the basis of this imaginary "prospectus." "The great majority of the property," said the Lord Chancellor, "I suppose, was settled at the time of the Disruption," and, when offered proof to the contrary: "Be it so; but do not let us waste time on what is really immaterial." Immaterial! A large part of the case for the Free Church is that by far the greater part of its funds and property are of comparatively recent creation, and are the product of the liberality of those who were in heartiest sympathy with the aims and policy of the union, and would utterly have repudiated the narrow and reactionary ideas of the minority. The Free Church, at the commencement, had no opportunity of accumulating funds; what it received perished in the using. By the time funds began to be accumulated, the spirit of union was in the air, and as the two churches grew closer, the funds still mounted up and up. Only a few figures can be given in illustration. Taking the eight principal funds of the church (by no means the whole) the progress is as follows: In 1853, total £14,999; in 1863, when union negotiations began, £83,545; in 1873, £181,953; in 1883, £397,754; in 1893, £710,844; in 1900 (the eve of union,) £824,344. These are the funds, the majority of which was supposed to be subscribed in 1843 on an Establishment "porspectus," and for that reason are now taken from the church that created them, and given to a company who contributed nothing to them, but were largely aided or supported out of them! Many of the donors are

living persons, compelled to submit to the humiliation of seeing their property thus alienated. As one example: in the city of Glasgow, a few years before the union, the sum of £137,000 was raised for the building of extension churches; but of this sum it is ascertained that only *fifteen guineas* were subscribed by members of the minority, to whom the whole property of the Church, both general and congregational, has been handed over!

The judgment now described was a reeling blow to the Church, but the effect of it has been surprising. So far from weakening or destroying the Church of the union, as perhaps some secretly hoped, and others feared it would, it braced and united the Church as nothing else could have done. For one thing it proved the reality of the union. People had doubted whether the union was more than nominal, had ascribed it to ecclesiastical policy and intrigue; had predicted that it would fall to pieces at the first touch of trial. This blow of the House of Lords raised it at once in the eyes of the world to the rank of a splendid fact. With astonishing fortitude, the Church stood fast to its avowed principles, and declared itself ready to sacrifice everything for the sake of spiritual liberty, and its testimony to a free gospel. Hardly a minister, not a missionary, not a professor, not a student in the three colleges, only one probationer—and he a United Presbyterian—deserted the ranks. The congregations stood firm, with only units here and there breaking off. The Highland ministers and their people, on whom the brunt of the stroke fell, nobly bore the sacrifice imposed on them in having to leave churches and manses, forcibly seized or taken from them by decree of the law courts. A great convocation meeting held in Edinburgh attended by ministers and people from all parts of the country, displayed unbounded courage and hope. An Emergency Fund, which had been started to meet immediate needs—for all invested funds and endowments had been impounded—rapidly rose towards the sum aimed at, £100,000.* The membership of the Church increased. December 31st, 1900, the membership of the United Church stood at 502,972—in its

It was announced on March 1st that the emergency fund amounted to the large sum of £132,000 and was still in progress.

Free Church section at 301,685—*being actually* 5,601 *more than at December* 31*st,* 1899, the last return before the union. It is difficult to obtain reliable statistics of the minority, but it may number from 4,000 to 5,000 communicants, mostly in the Highlands. It boasts of some 60,000 adherents, but these figures, as the statistics of loss of the United Free Church show, are quite mythical. In many places where three or four churches are claimed, its adherents are only a few score persons—in some quarters it is hard to discover them at all.

The one thing obvious to everybody from the beginning was that, whatever, the law courts might decree, it was utterly impossible for the minority to administer more than the merest fraction of the vast trust committed to it. They could not fill the pulpits; they could not utilize the churches; they had not professors or students to occupy the colleges; they could do nothing to work the missions. The only chance of the work of the church going on was by the United Free Church continuing to do it. There was the strongest call, therefore, for some equitable arrangement which might redress, in part at least, the wrong that had been done, and secure that the work of the church would not suffer. This, however, was not to be. The only minds into which no glimmer of the inequity that had been perpetrated seemed to enter, were those of the victorious minority. The law had given them possession, and they meant to keep it, and part with nothing they could by any means hold. From first to last their position has been that defined in the words of their moderator—"Not a stick or a stone." If there is any part which they find, after years of trial, they cannot use, let it be disposed of as the state wills, but, if possible, let it *not* be given back to the United Free Church. After the decision, attempts were made to reach a reasonable basis of settlement with the minority by means of conferences. These, however, were wrecked by the uncompromising determination of the smaller body to yield nothing. Temporary possession of certain colleges, churches, etc., might be granted, on condition that nothing was taught or preached contrary to the "dogmatic teaching" of the trust, "as enunciated by the House of Lords!" In particular, demand was

made for the possession of the fine group of buildings on the Mound, Edinburgh, the assembly hall, the college buildings, the magnificent library of the college, the church offices. The assembly hall had been recently enlarged and adapted for the purposes of a church of half a million members; but this "legal" church of some 30 ministers claimed its exclusive use—and, through decree of the law courts, which ground out remorselessly the music of the superior decision, *got* it, with the college, and all the other buildings. The United Free Church College was now dispossessed, but, happily, found temporary shelter within the hospitable walls of the University. The legal "Free Church" then set up its own institution—a college, with a staff of one professor, aided by lecturers got in to help, (a Reformed Presbyterian, a quondam Baptist minister, a professor from the "Original Seceders," a lecturer on Scotch Church History one day a week), and some 14 "students"—nine Scotch and five Irish. But of the Scotch students it is understood that not one has passed a university preliminary examination, or taken a university arts course, as required by the laws of the Church, and the continued allegiance of the Irish students is extremely doubtful. On these aspirants valuable bursaries and scholarships, without academic qualification, have been squandered; while those for whom these aids and rewards were designed are deprived of their use. This may seem an unrelieved picture of sordid unreasonableness to draw of the minority. It is only fair to say, however, that, while it is true to the letter of the leaders, and real dictators of the policy of the body, there are individuals in the "Free Church" camp of better spirit, who, if they had their way, would willingly come to a reasonable understanding. But their influence thus far in the counsels of the party has been absolutely null. In public, the attacks upon the United Free Church are directed chiefly against its alleged "mutilation" of the Bible—as to which the most outrageous statements are made. This subject was never mentioned in the case before the House of Lords.

Manwhile the force of public opinion, combined with the manifest inability of the legal church to administer

the trust, moved the government to take action, and, after consultation with both sides, but not with the free consent of the minority, steps were taken to appoint a royal commission—or rather two commissions; one, the main commission, consisting of Lord Elgin, (chairman) Lord Kinnear and Sir Ralph Anstruthe, to "inquire into all the facts of the case," and frame proposals which may be a basis for legislation; the other, a "one-man" commission, consisting of Sir John Cheyne, to make temporary arrangements, by consent of parties, till such proposals are matured. The minority had in the interval lost no opportunity of "making hay" by pressing their claims in the law courts, which, working out the judgment of the higher court, gave them nearly all they asked. The commissions, too, are necessarily limited in their powers by the fact that the judgment of the House of Lords—inequitable as it is—is throughout assumed as settling the question of right. Indeed, on this ground, Lord Elgin's commission ruled out at the commencement all evidence on the "intentions of donors," though this is a vital part of the "facts" to be inquired into. Sir John Cheyne, in like manner, has awarded to the Free Church buildings to which, on no ground of equity, they have any right—this to the dispossession of the congregations which, in some cases, built the churches, and alone are able to utilize them. With experience of success, the claims of the minority have steadily increased, till now they actually claim over 300 churches, many of them, as said , in places where they have not a shadow of a real congregation. As these commissions have not yet completed their work, we refrain from further comment. The evidence that is being accumulated must ultimately open the eyes of the public to many points in the case on which most are even yet very imperfectly informed.

In fine, we do not hesitate to say that the recent judgment, in its grounds and its effects, is an outrage on all justice—a new persecution of the Church in these Realms such as could hardly have been believed possible under free institutions in the 20th century. That it will be overruled for good no one doubts, but the trial is severe. Doubtless the Church needed such purifying. But the

things for which it has been called to suffer are not its faults, but the things which are its glory—its aspirations after Christian union, its testimony for a free gospel of God's grace to mankind and for the inherent spirituality and freedom of the church, its refusal to let a mere figment of theoretical opinion like the so-called "Establishment principle," stand between it and the accomplishment of a great Christian duty. The United Free Church has gained vigor, elasticity, confidence in the future from its baptism of fire; if the legal "Free Church" is the heir to anything in the old Free Church, it is to its mistakes and prejudices.

THE ANABAPTISTS OF EUROPE.

BY PROF. W. J. M'GLOTHLIN, Ph. D., D. D.

The Anabaptist movement constitutes one of the six general directions taken by the Reformation of the sixteenth century. The relation of this party to the pre-Reformation sects of the later Middle Ages is not clear. On the ground of the undoubted similarity in doctrines and life it is claimed that the Anabaptists are a continuation of these mediaeval evangelical sects. This may be true, but it cannot be proven and several facts militate against this conclusion. Some of these are, (1) The movement rose among the followers of Luther and Zwingli in close connection with Wittenberg and Zürich, the two earliest centers of reformatory activity. (2) All the leaders of the Anabaptist movement so far as their personal history can be traced, came out of the Catholic church, and not out of any of the sects. (3) It arose and flourished in its earlier stages on soil which had been very little if at all affected by the earlier sects. (4) The Anabaptists were not conscious of any connection with earlier sects, but distinctly declared that they were setting up anew the truth of God that had long been obscured. (5) They never united with or entered into communion with any of the sects that still existed at the time. These considerations render it improbable that the Anabaptists had any direct connection with these earlier sects. They thought they were drawing their views fresh from a renewed study of the Scriptures, and this conclusion seems to be the most probable one.

The Anabaptists made a profound impression upon the sixteenth century. They were condemned at the Diet of the Empire in 1529; their views are mentioned and rejected in all the principal Protestant creeds down to that of Westminster; all the leading reformers, such as Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Knox and many others battled against them; most of the governments of western Europe decreed their extermination. Only a very brief

sketch of their history can be given here.

They arose almost simultaneously and with apparent independence in central Germany and in Northern Switzerland. In central Germany the most influential man among them was Thomas Münzer. He was a man of education and ability, a friend of Luther. At the outbreak of the Reformation he was pastor at Zwickau. Associated with him was one Nicholas Storch, who held radical views and was said to be in communication with the Bohemian Brethren across the border. Münzer encouraged Storch to set up a church embodying his views, and on Dec. 16, 1521, he was araigned before the municipal authorities on the charge of repudiating infant baptism. This was the beginning of the movement in Germany. Along with the repudiation of infant baptism went other radical views such as the rejection of oaths, magistracy and war and the insistence on community of goods.

In company with Marcus Stubner, Storch set out for Wittenberg, in the hope of winning the university for his views.

His faith was rewarded by the conversion of Carlstadt, the rector of the university, and Cellarius, a learned Hebrew and Aramaic scholar. Melanchthon was deeply affected. Luther was then in hiding at the Wartburg, having been put under the ban of the Empire at the Diet of Worms in May. Hearing of the radical utterances and doings at Wittenberg, he risked his life to return and put things in order. He appeared suddenly in the city, preached eight sermons, on eight successive days and completely overthrew the "new prophets." This scattered the party. The leaders, especially Münzer and Pfeifer, became more and more radical. They began to preach the setting up of the kingdom of God on earth and soon took the final step of attempting to set it up. The result was the Peasants' war of 1525, when the whole movement was quenched in blood and 100,000 peasants perished. Münzer was among the number.

It is impossible to tell how far the Anabaptists were involved in this movement. Münzer can hardly be properly called an Anabaptist. He was opposed to infant baptism, but was never himself, so far as known, rebaptized nor did he administer believer's baptism to others. But

the Peasants' war brought the Anabaptists into an ill-repute from which they never recovered in central Germany.

The next center to be noted is Zürich, in Switzerland. Here Zwingli began to preach reformatory doctrines from about 1519 on. He was cool, cautious, conservative. Around him gathered a party of young men, priests and laymen, who were much more radical than himself. Serious differences began to be manifest about 1523. This body of radicals insisted upon setting up a church of the regenerate, and of proceeding to the act at once without waiting for the action of the city council as Zwingli wished to do. The leaders in this group were Conrad Grebel, son of one of the leading men of the city and a fine Greek scholar; Felix Manz, an excellent Hebrew scholar, who preached from his Hebrew Bible; William Reublin, a priest; Ludwig Hätzer, a learned priest and George Blaurock, a runaway monk, and others. The fundamental difference between them and Zwingli was the conception of the church. They held that it should be composed of believers only. Zwingli denied both the practicability and Scripturalness of their position. Their views naturally involved the repudiation of infant baptism and this subject came under discussion in the spring of 1524. At first Zwingli hesitated, but finally decided to retain infant baptism. Late in 1524 or early in 1525 they took the final step and instituted believer's baptism by Grebel's baptizing Blaurock, who then baptized Grebel and others. This was, apparently, by sprinkling or pouring.

The movement spread with marvellous rapidity despite bitter persecution, which broke out at once. We soon find a strong colony in the canton of St. Gall. Wolfgang Ulimann, their leader was baptized by immersion in the Rhine, and it is probable that others practiced this mode. They were numerous also in the cantons of Berne, Basel, Schaffhausen and others; in fact, in all the cantons where the Reformation had entered they were found.

In close connection with Switzerland a very interesting case occurred in Waldshut, a small town in the Austrian lands just outside Switzerland to the North. Here Balthaser Hubmaier was priest. He was a remarkable man. Born near Augsburg about 1480, he was educated at the

University of Friburg, where he enjoyed the instruction and friendship of the famous John Eck. He followed this man to Ingolstadt, where he became preacher to the University and professor in that institution. Soon afterwards he became cathedral preacher in the old cathedral town of Regensburg, where he preached with great acceptance. Here he undertook a Jewish persecution, destroyed a synagogue and on the site built a chapel of which he became pastor. Pretended miracles brought crowds of pilgrims. These he, at first, encouraged, but afterwards opposed and was compelled to leave. He became pastor at Waldshut. Here he gradually adopted evangelical views. He then went on to Anabaptist views and in the spring of 1525 was baptized upon a profession of his faith. Henceforth, he is the chief literary representative of the Anabaptists. No man, even in modern times, has more fully understood the Baptist position as to the subjects of baptism or more clearly and forcibly stated that position. In the next two years he wrote many tracts on a great variety of subjects, and his clearness and vigor were always equal to his diligence.

Swiss persecution now became very determined. Hubmaier was driven into Austria, Grebel died of the pest in 1526, Manz was executed by drowning at Zürich, in 1527, Blaurock was burned in Tyrol, in 1529. The authorities in the various Swiss cantons, largely at the instigation of Zwingli, drove the Anabaptists out as far as possible. Several were executed. By 1529 only a few were left, hidden away in the nooks and corners of the mountainous districts. These have maintained themselves, especially in the canton of Berne, amid much suffering and persecution, down to the present time. They now practice both sprinkling and immersion and are not in fellowship with the Swiss Baptists.

Driven from Switzerland, the Anabaptists sought refuge in the free cities of South Germany, such as Strassburg, Augsburg and Ulm, and in the Austrian lands. The leading men in South Germany were Ludwig Hätzer and Hans Denck. Both were highly educated and were men of literary ability. Both were masters of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. Denck was rector of the famous

St. Sebaldus school at Nuremberg at the time of his conversion to Anabaptist views. He was a profound thinker, a mystic, a man of the deepest piety. These two together made the first translation of the prophets from the Hebrew into German. Their work ran through several editions before Luther's translation of the prophets appeared. The authorities in these South German cities had practically exterminated the Anabaptists by 1530. Those who had fled from Switzerland into the Austrian lands gradually gathered in Moravia, which was a "goodly land" for all the persecuted at that time. The freedom from persecution was due to the weakness of the government and the strength of the anti-Catholic views which had come down from the Hussite reform. The Anabaptists gathered chiefly at Nikolsburg and from this point Hubmaier sent out most of his writings. His prominence made him an easy mark for the government. He was seized in July, 1527, and in March, 1528, was burned at the stake. Three days later his wife was drowned. The Anabaptists of Moravia practiced community of goods for the most part. They were industrious and frugal, and soon became valued citizens. But their lords could not protect them. They were gradually exterminated, the last of them disappearing about 1762. A few families moved to Southern Russia, where they remained until 1874, when they removed to South Dakota. There they still preserve their communal life.

Returning to the West, we have to follow the movement along the Rhine and in the Low Countries. We have already seen that Strassburg, being a free city of the Empire, was for a long time an asylum for the Anabaptists. Among them the most important man for the later history was Melchior Hofmann, a furrier from Swabia. He had accepted reformed views, knew the letter of the Scripture almost perfectly and was deeply interested in prophecy applying it to his own day. From 1523 on, he was a zealous lay preacher, going as far as Sweden and Denmark in his missionary journeys. About 1530 he united with the Anabaptists at Strassburg. He had already determined that the kingdom of God was to be set up on earth in 1533 and that Strassburg was to be the center. With these chiliastic notions, he now went forth

to prepare for the appearance of the Lord. His preaching on both sides of the lower Rhine had marvellous effect, both in the Netherlands and in Westphalia. Great numbers were converted and the whole country was fired with his chiliastic expectations. Holland was almost competely won for the Anabaptists. In 1533 he quietly returned to Strassburg to await the appearance of the Lord. He was seized and thrown into prison where he died several years later.

He had won to his views a fanatical baker of Haarlem named Jan Matthys. This man was consumed with hatred of the upper classes and his imagination fired with the expected vengeance of the Lord. Hofmann had in 1531 suspended baptism for two years, intimating that at the end of that time the Lord would appear. Matthys had a vision instructing him that baptism should recommence and that he himself was the expected prophet Enoch. Thousands were baptized in a short time. The episcopal city of Münster in Westphalia had recently accepted the Reformation and then Anabaptist views had quickly taken strong root there. It was now revealed to Jan Matthys that Münster and not Strassburg was to be the New Jerusalem. Thousands of fanatical Anabaptists were gathered into the city, a theocracy was set up and in the name of God and religion such enormities were perpetrated as the world has scarcely seen elsewhere. For more than a year this orgy of vice and crime continued, until it was finally quenched in blood by the forces of the bishop in 1535. This frightful episode brought such shame upon the Anabaptist name that the Baptists of the continent still suffer from it to-day.

The fragments of the movement that were still amenable to reason, the so-called quiet Anabaptists, were gathered up by Menno Simon, a Dutch priest of West Friesland, who openly joined the movement in 1537. He was a man of energy and ability and earnestly convinced of the truth of his views. Under his direction the quiet Anabaptists over all the lands on the lower Rhine were organized. They denied all connection with the Münster fanatics and took the name of their leader, and hence are known to us as Mennonites. Through much persecution by the state church and much internal division and

strife among themselves, they have maintained their existence down to the present. They now form a respectable body in the Netherlands and are found in other lands, notably in continental Europe and in America.

The exegencies of trade and the pressure of persecution in the Netherlands drove a good many Dutch Anabaptists to England, where they settled chiefly along the eastern coast. They are found there from about 1530 on, but they do not seem to have affected the native English very deeply or widely. It is not known that any Anabaptist congregations were formed. Some of the Baptist churches of England which claim to date back to the 16th century may have come out of Anabaptist congregations. But these claims are not satisfactorily attested by contemporary documentary evidence. As a matter of fact, the English Baptists differed widely from the start from the Anabaptists in both practices and beliefs—so widely as almost to preclude the belief that the English Baptists are a historical continuation of the Anabaptists as a denomination. They differed from the start as widely as do the Baptists and Mennonites today and in some respects more widely.

Turning now from this brief and imperfect survey of their history, let us glance at the doctrines and practices of the Anabaptists. There were many parties among them and scarcely any general statement can be applied to all of them. They agreed only in their opposition to infant baptism and their insistence upon a converted church membership. Their views may be divided into three general classes, religious, political and sociological, though all rested upon a religious basis.

I. Their religious views. 1. The organizing idea of the party, the doctrine which gave the movement its unity and strength was the conception of the church as a community of believers. This position they held against both Catholics and Protestants. From this doctrine flowed necessarily two others, viz., baptism of believers only and the exercise of strict discipline in complete independence of the state. On these doctrines they were entirely united —they baptized only believers, exercisd the most rigid discipline and insisted on complete separation of the church from the state. They regarded infant baptism as

that invention of the devil which was most injurious to Christianity. Church discipline was to be exercised by the congregation, not by the state and not by any officer or officers in the church.

2. The great majority held to the ordinary conception of the Trinity, and the person and work of Christ. But some, notably Hans Denck and the Polish Anabaptists, held Socinian views of Christ; while others, as Melchior Hofmann, and Menno Simon and many of their followers denied the reality of his human nature.

3. As to the plan of salvation, they were Anti-Augustinian, the only party of the reformers who held this position. They laid great emphasis upon life rather than doctrine. Other reformers, they said, were trying to amend doctrines; they were trying to renew lives. They carried on a sharp criticism on the morals of the reformers. They laid great emphasis upon following Jesus, putting in work as one of the elements in the plan of salvation. They emphasized the freedom of the will and moral responsibility.

4. Some of them, at least, believed that exclusion from the church closed the gate of heaven against the excluded member. The ban of the church must be removed before salvation was possible.

5. They were opposed to paying the ministry a stated sum, but believed that the ministers should be supported by the free-will offerings of the churches as the people felt moved to give.

6. Their conception of the ordinances was that they are symbolic only. Baptism was usually administered by affusion, though immersion was practiced also, notably in Poland, where it was the only mode. There was no discussion between them and the reformers on the "mode," but only the subject of baptism.

7. They held the New Testament in higher esteem than the Old, and laid special emphasis on the Sermon on the Mount, a view that was then very radical. They were literalists in interpretation.

8. They believed in a divine call to the ministry and laid little emphasis upon ordination. The movement was a great outburst of lay preaching. Preachers were not stationed pastors, but travelled two by two, preaching

wherever opportunity offered. In general they insisted strongly upon the inner testimony of the Spirit. They were chosen in the congregation by the use of the lot after prayer. At first those at Zürich opposed singing, but later the Anabaptists generally were noted for their singing and wrote a great many songs. Many of them were sung to popular tunes already in circulation, and thereby gained in popularity and influence.

9. Their organization seems to have been at first purely congregational. All ecclesiastical action was taken by the entire membership. Later among the Mennonites a larger organization was developed.

10. They were opposed to persecution for religious opinion. Hubmaier wrote a tract in which he expresses the conviction, very remarkable for that time, that not even a Turk should be persecuted because of his religion. It was easy, of course, for them to hold this view, since they were always in the minority and suffering persecution. Even Lutherans and Calvinists cried out against persecution under such circumstances. What the Anabaptists would have done had they been in a majority, it is impossible to say, but opposition to persecution would seem to flow naturally from their intense individualism in religious affairs.

II. Their political views. Their attitude towards politics and the state was purely a negative one. They regarded the state as a necessary evil, ordained of God, but too corrupt for the participation of Christian men.

1. No Christian could hold civil office, because the position involved his intimate association with wicked men and required him to bear the sword in punishment of crime. Most of them were opposed to capital punishment. Hubmaier, however, taught that Christians might rightfully hold office.

2. They were opposed to war in any form and refused absolutely to bear arms. Most of them, however, were willing to pay wartaxes and render such service in the army as did not require them to bear arms or fight.

3. The function of the state was to punish the bad and protect the good. It had no religious duties. This was in direct contradiction to the almost universal thought of that time. It was the duty of the individual to obey the

state in all requirements which did not conflict with his religious convictions and duties. Where the conscience of the individual began the power of the state ceased.

4. They refused absolutely to take an oath except under duress, because Jesus said, "Swear not at all." At that time the oath was regarded as the foundation of civil government, and their refusal to swear aroused the suspicion that they were opposed to all government. When they were sometimes forced to swear to save their lives, they did not regard the oath as binding, and thus often laid themselves open to the charge of perjury.

III. Sociological views. 1. The great majority of them were socialistic, or communistic, believing in a community of goods. This was based on the example of the early Christians. This doctrine was one of the chief causes of persecution by the property holders. In Moravia they actually realized their ideal in great communal buildings where vast amounts of manufacturing and trade were carried on.

2. They were opposed to the payment of tithes and other rents for the support of the church.

3. They were opposed to the payment of interest on borrowed money or other articles.

It will be seen from this summary that their sociological and political views were as revolutionary as those on religion. They were undoubtedly equally fruitful in bringing on persecution. It will also be seen that many views, regarded as of fundamental importance by them, have never been advocated by our own denomination. In some of their peculiarities, the Quakers are much more their successors than are the Baptists. Glancing back over their doctrines, it will be seen that in many points they were far ahead of their generation, the modern men of their time.

AN EXEGESIS OF JAMES 5:14-20.

BY E. J. FORRESTER, D. D.

The passage falls into four sections: (1) vv. 14 and 15: (2) v. 16; (3) vv. 16-18; (4) vv. 19 and 20.

These parts will be taken up in order; the language will be construed; and, as exactly as we may discover it, the thought of the sacred writer will be disclosed.

1. "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." (vv.14 and 15.)

Here are three items to be examined: (1) The sickness supposed; (2) The remedy prescribed; (3) The result assured.

(1) The sickness supposed. The word rendered "sick" is from *σθένος* "strength," and *α* privative, and means "without strength." The word, therefore, describes a condition of weakness. The degree of weakness is not indicated; but weakness is, doubtless, emphasized by the choice of the word. It is a fact, also, that this word is used in connection with several notable cases of extreme illness recorded in the Scriptures, and so seems to have been the favorite word to set forth that sort of condition. Such cases were: that of the nobleman's son, who was sick at Capernaum, and who was "at the point of death;" that of the servant of the centurion of Capernaum, who was "sick," "and ready to die," if we follow the Receptus; that of the brother of Mary and Martha, of whom John wrote, "A certain man was sick, named Lazarus," and who, as we know, was sick unto death; and that of Tabitha, of whom the writer of the Acts recorded, that "she was sick, and died." Let it be further observed that, in the hypothetical case before us, the sick man was not to go to the elders, but was to send for them to come to him; and, still further, that when the sick man should be healed, he would be "rais-

ed up;" and, finally on this point, that in the expression, "the prayer of faith shall save the sick," the word rendered "sick" is different from the one so rendered in v. 14, and means "wearied out," and suggests a condition in which strength has been exhausted in the struggle with disease. It seems safe to say that all these considerations taken together permit us to hold that James was prescribing for cases of extreme illness.

(2) The remedy prescribed. Four points are to be distinguished: (a) The sick man was to send for the elders of the church; (b) The elders were to anoint the sick man with oil in the name of the Lord; (c) The elders were to pray over the sick man; (d) The sick man was to pray for himself.

(a) The sick man was to send for the elders. It is not that they are to come of their own accord, and to volunteer their kindly offices; but the sick man is to have despair enough with regard to all other remedies, and faith enough with regard to this, to take the initiative in the matter. Observe that it is the elders who are to be sent for—not any class of people who might be endowed with the charism of miraculous healing; for, so far as we are informed, that charism was not an endowment of the elders as such. It was to be the elders, not, therefore, as miraculously endowed, but as the leaders of the church, and so the representatives of the church in its ordinary spiritual power—as the church in miniature.

(b) The elders were to anoint the sick man with oil in the name of the Lord. Why anoint with oil? The oil was hardly to be applied with medicinal intent. It is true that such use of oil was freely made in the time of James. It was not, however, the only remedy and the remedy for all diseases. The fact that, so far as material things go, oil is the only prescription James here makes, where he is giving a remedy for all cases of extreme illness, is enough it would appear, to show that he is not prescribing oil as a medicine. So to prescribe it would be to say that he regarded oil as the only worthy medicine for extreme cases of sickness of all sorts. It is hardly fair to James to hold him to any such medical opinion. But, if not for medicine, then why the anointing? Two suggestions will be made, either one or both of which may be true. One

of them rests upon a practice of Jesus and the Twelve. Recall, for example, the case of the blind man whose eyes Jesus anointed with clay and whom he directed to wash in the pool of Siloam (Jno. 9:6); and compare the case of Naaman (2 Kings 5.) See, also, the statement that the Twelve "anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." (Mark 6:13.) Now, why should oil, water, or clay be used in such cases of miraculous healing? Why, if not to show that they who wrought the cures were in league with One who could work, at will, with or without the use of means? The other suggestion is, that oil was intended to be a symbol of the Spirit by whose power the cure was to be effected, such symbolism being familiar to the Jewish mind of James. Both of these suggestions are believed to be reasonable; and they do not exclude each other. Both of them may be held, as illustrating what may be here set down as a true principle of Scripture hermeneutics, viz., that where the Holy Spirit employed an expression which will bear either or both of two interpretations equally well, and the context of which can not be made to decide between them, he probably intended that both should be understood.

(c) The elders were to pray over the sick man. They were not endowed with healing power, and could only look to God. Nor is it said that they were to instruct the sick man to ignore his symptoms, and all would be well. On the contrary, so far as this prescription goes, they were to pray, and leave the matter at that.

(d) The sick man was to pray. That is not expressly stated, but it is implied in the result promised. A part of that result was that, in case of disease growing out of personal sin, the sin would be forgiven, as well as the disease cured. The forgiveness of sin thus assured implies that the sufferer has participated in the prayer that was offered.

It is worthy of note in this connection, that in v. 15, where this prayer is described as "the prayer of faith," a different word is used for "prayer" from that used in v. 16, in the phrase "the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man." In v. 16 it is δέησις the radical idea of which is "supplication;' while in v. 15 the word is εὐχή the radical idea of which is "vow." It would

not do to press this difference to the point of saying that we ought to render: "the vow of faith shall save the sick." This word εὐχή is used in only two other places in the New Testament. In both those places it is properly rendered "vow." (Acts 18:18 and 21:23.) It is true, as a general principle of interpretation, that if a word is invariably used in a certain sense, in Scripture, where the sense can be certainly determined, when a case is met with in which its meaning cannot be certainly determined from the context, we must fall back upon its invariable meaning in the other passages. The context in the case before us, however, sufficiently points away from the exclusive meaning of "vow," and to the meaning of "prayer" (which the word in cognate form certainly bears) to justify us in rendering it "prayer" in this passage. We should not, however, exclude the meaning of "vow," but should allow the word to bring us this richer meaning of "prayer" with the idea of "vow" included. That is to say, we may understand the Holy Spirit to intend, by the selection of this particular word, to teach that, along with supplication made for the recovery of the sick man, there should go a vow of consecration. This, it may be observed, in passing, is an additional reason for holding that the sick man himself was to engage in the prayer, seeing that he alone could properly make the vow for himself.

(3) The result assured. The sick man would be healed. There are two general aspects of this general result.

(a) The body would be healed. "The prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up." The word rendered "save" is used for both physical and spiritual salvation. Here it means physical healing.

(b) The soul, also, would be healed, if the physical debility should chance to be the result of personal sin. "If he have committed sins,they shall be forgiven him." The expression, "if he have committed sins," is, in the Greek form, a very subtle one, showing that, in the case supposed, the sick man is in a condition of guilt—a state of having committed sin, and strongly suggesting that his physical condition is the result of his spiritual state and history.

Does James, then, mean to say that this result of his

prescription is absolutely assured? There is nothing in the form of his expressions to indicate that he does not mean just that. There are two external considerations, however, which compel us to understand him as giving his prescription, not as an infallible remedy always entirely certain to bring physical healing, but as the best and only hope in cases of extreme sickness where everything else has been tried without avail. The two considerations that compel us to understand him in this qualified sense are: Our belief in his common sense; and our belief in his divine inspiration. He was a man of good sense, else he could not have been leading elder in the church at Jerusalem, and he could not have written this strong and practical letter. Being a man of sense, he knew that some people died in spite of all the praying that could be done for them. He was inspired, also, and has given us inspired teaching. The Holy Spirit would not inspire him to teach that any remedy could be applied with unfailing success as to physical healing. The Holy Spirit would not so inspire him because it is not true. Not even the special charism of healing in those days was so bestowed that the persons thus endowed could always heal. Paul says (2 Tim. 4.20) that he left Trophimus "at Miletum sick." Why was not Trophimus healed by a man, who, on another occasion, was enabled to restore Eutychus to life? Paul himself had a "thorn in the flesh" (II Cor. 2:7-9) for the removal of which he very earnestly prayed. If his own prayers were by any chance not deemed sufficient, why did he not call in the elders and have them add their prayers to his? Why was his physical infirmity not removed? He answers the question. He says that the Lord said to him: "My grace is sufficient for you; for my strength is made perfect in weakness." We are obliged, therefore, to understand James in a qualified sense with respect to physical healing. That, however, is not true with regard to the spiritual aspect of the result which he declares will follow the use of his prescription. Here we are to take him without qualification.

2. "Confess your faults one to another and pray one for another, that ye may be healed." (v. 16a.)

The Canterbury and American Standard Revisions

have very properly substituted "sins" for "faults." The word "faults," as it is commonly understood, is too restricted. The word used by James, παραπτώματα may have been once well enough represented by the English "faults;" but, in the evolution of language, that has ceased to be true. We think of faults as blemishes of character. That is our first and chief thought. The radical idea in παρατώματα is "failure," "falling short," just as the radical idea in παράβασις is "transgression," "going beyond." In the New Testament, the most general term for "sin' is ἁμαρτία —in the singular to represent sin in the abstract, and in the plural to represent concrete cases of sin, whether of default or of transgrssion. When, therefore, James uses the particular word παράπτωμα instead of the plural of the general word ἁμαρτία we are to understand, perhaps, that he has uppermost in mind sins of a particular class; and when he uses that particular word, instead of the other particular word παράβασις we are to understand that the class of sins uppermost in his mind are sins of falling short. Or we may be allowed to suppose that, for the moment, he regards the Christian's normal condition as one of complete harmony with the standard of right, and sin of any sort as a falling from that normal condition.

The confession of sin here enjoined being qualified as to the direction it is to take, would seem therein to be qualified also as to the scope of it. In other words, if we are to confess our sins to one another, the confession must be of such sins as may be characterized as social sins. If, therefore, I have sinned against any particular brother, which, of course, is at the same time and always, a sin against God also, I am to confess the sin to that brother; and he and I together are to pray God to grant me forgiveness. If I sin in such way as that my sin is an offense to my church, and a hindrance to its work, I am to confess to the church; and the church and I together are to pray God to grant me forgiveness.

3. "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." (Then comes the example of Elijah.) (vv. 16b-18.)

Much power is ascribed to prayer of a certain sort.

What sort? There are three descriptive notes. (1) It is the prayer of a "righteous man." James does not mean a "perfect" man. He did not know any "perfect" men, in the modern sense of the expression. It is not hard to discover his idea of a "righteous" man. He was one who both believed and worked, who had faith and showed his faith by his words. (2) It is a prayer that is here brought into some sort of relation to a very peculiar word, the meaning of which we shall try to determine. The word is rendered by King James "effectual fervent." By the Canterbury and the American Standard Revisions it is construed as a participle, not with an adjective, but with a verbal signification; and hence they render: "The supplication of a righteous man availeth much in its working." "In its working" is the phrase that represents our participle *ἐνεργουμένη*. I do not believe that rendering is correct. The participle is in form either passive or middle. If we should take it as middle, we could only make out of it that the prayer is one that works in the subject or for the subject, the person who offers it; and so we should have the strange meaning that a righteous man's prayer works mightily in him or for him, and should translate: The supplication of a righteous man availeth much in its working in him or, for him. But we could not adopt any such rendering as either of those. If, on the other hand, we should take the participle as passive, it would signify "inwrought," and the meaning would be that the prayer of a righteous man when inwrought (by the Holy Spirit, of course,) availeth much; and we should translate: A righteous man's inwrought supplication availeth much.

The objection to this view is that we have no certain case of such use of *ἐνεργουμένη* in the New Testament. It is, in fact, however, a very rare form. In 2 Cor. 1:6 and Gal. 5:6, we find it, but in both those places there is the same impossibility that we here meet, of determining with entire certainty, just what is the sense. As the passage in Galatians is the briefer of the two, I take that as an illustrative example. We there find the expression: "In Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love." So King James. But does *πίστις δὶ ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη*

certainly mean "faith which worketh by love?" If we should make a translation of this passage in Galatians parallel with that made by the Canterbury revisers, of our passage in James, we should render: "In Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith in its working through love." Now, that, we immediately say, is not the meaning of Paul. He is placing spiritual religion in contrast and opposition to formal, ceremonial religion. It is not what the Galatians can do, in the way of external ceremonial performance, that is going to be of avail for their salvation, but it is an inward, spiritual grace, the grace of faith that is inwrought through divine love. So, then, we might make parallel renderings of the passages in Galatians and ours in James, thus:

"In Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith inwrought by love."—Galatians 5:6.

"A righteous man's inwrought supplication availeth much."—James 5:16b.

In Galatians it is inwrought faith; in James it is inwrought prayer. In one place, it is inwrought faith that avails; in the other, it is inwrought prayer that avails.

This view of our writer's use of the word in question is supported, to some extent, by a similar use of cognate forms to signify internal operation by the Good and the Evil Spirit. (I Cor. 12:6, 10; Eph. 1:19; II Thess. 2:9). It finds some support also in the early Christian designation of the New Testament demoniacs as ἐνεργοῦμενοι.

(3) The third note descriptive of this prayer is the selection of the word for "prayer." It is δέησις. The ground idea is supplication. It was not necessary to speak of prayer in any other aspect as requiring to be inwrought to make it effective.

In illustration of the general statement he has made with respect to the power of prayer, James points to a locus classicus of the Old Testament—the great historical example of Elijah. He was a "righteous" man. In the execution of his God-given mission, he presented an inwrought, God-inspired supplication. His inwrought supplication availed much, even though he was a man of like nature with us.

4. "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." Three points are to be considered: the apostasy, the reclamation and the reward.

(1) The apostasy supposed. "If any of you do err from the truth.' It is "the truth as it is in Jesus," "the word of truth," of 1:18. The "erring" is primarily intellectual, but extends, of course, to the affections and the will, and manifests itself in outward life.

(2) The reclamation supposed. If "one convert him." It is through the agency of one who has not apostatized that the reclamation is to be effected. There are always those who will lead others astray, and keep them astray, if only they can. (2 Pet. 2:18; 3:17.) Over against that dark fact is the glowing possibility of delivering the seduced from the power of their seducers and leading them back to the truth and to right living.

(3) The reward proposed. It is two-fold. (a) The sins of the erring life will be forgiven by the Lord. (b) The erring soul, brought back to the right way, will, through the divine forgiveness, be saved from death, that is, perdition.

Of course, the question of "falling from grace" comes up here, as it does in many places in Scripture and in actual life. The answer is presumed to be familiar to all preachers of the Calvinistic, Augustinian, Pauline type of theology.

THE PASTOR LEADING HIS TEACHERS IN THE STUDY OF RELIGIOUS PEDAGOGY.*

BY REV. A. H. M'KINNEY.

The good man was in his study all the morning, preparing for the mid-week prayer meeting. He had studied, prayed and communed much. He had ascended the heights and he felt confident that he had a message to which his people would listen and from which they would derive great benefit. Under the inspiration of his preparation, he does his very best in delivering the message, but his efforts seem to be fruitless. It is as much as some of his hearers can do to keep awake, while the faces of others plainly indicate that they are listening more because of habit than because they are really interested.

The pastor goes to bed, tossing about, as he prays and questions himself as to why his well-prepared message failed to arouse his people. He blames them; then he blames himself, but there is no satisfaction in either course of procedure. He gets nothing to help him in his preparation for the next prayer meeting.

Wherein lay the fault? Not in the pastor's preparation, but in his ignorance of, or neglect of, a well known pedagogical principle, that known as apperception. According to this principle it is impossible to make any impression on the mind unless there is something in the mind upon which the fact or truth to be learned may be placed.

The following account of an unsuccessful attempt to illustrate "the love of God" proves the necessity for the recognition and the application of this principle:

I had taught the class for about six weeks, and had gotten on well with all the boys, except one, who was about thirteen years of age, and who seemed to be interested in the topic of the day until the time came for making the personal application. For example, the thought was, "God is love." I wished to illustrate it, and I would say to my boy: "Albert, God loves you. He loves you more than

your father loves you.'' Then there came into the boy's eye a look that I could not understand. It was hard and cold. Sometimes there was a sneer on his face and I imagined that my boy did not care to learn about the love of God.

One Sunday afternoon he was absent from the class, and the next morning I was irresistibly impelled to visit his home. On entering the room in the rear tenement, to my surprise, I found that the boy was there instead of at school. His mother was very silent and reserved. After repeated efforts to engage her in conversation, I said to myself, ''That is what is the matter with Albert; he takes after his mother.'' But the Spirit said to me, ''That is not all; there is some other reason for the boy's actions.'' So I chatted as pleasantly as I could to the woman, who responded in monosyllables. Suddenly, without any apparent cause, she burst out weeping, and said: ''Don't be hard on my boy.'' I replied: ''I am not hard on your boy. I love him. That is the reason I am here this morning instead of being at my work.''

Again I went on talking, while the woman merely said ''yes'' or ''no,'' as occasion demanded. Again, apparently without any reason she burst out crying. When she could control herself she said: ''I must tell somebody; I may as well tell you as anybody else. My boy and I spent the night out in that alley way, and his father was in this room crazy drunk, threatening to kill us with a bread knife if either of us came into the room.'' Then it was as if the heavens had opened to give me light. I had been trying to teach the boy that God loved him, and had foolishly illustrated that love by a father's love. He had no father. A brute lived in the same house with him. Was it any wonder that he did not want God's love? Afterward, however, when I could take my boy aside and say to him, ''Albert, God loves you more than your mother loves you,'' he understood just what I meant, and responded to my teachings.

That God is love is a grand truth; but that we are illustrating that truth in the right way is a question. Perhaps some with whom we have to deal do not know of the love of God because of our lack of wisdom in presenting

that love. The principle of apperception will help us here as elsewhere.

It is not a rare occurrence to meet a pastor who declares that in spite of his studious preparation for preaching and his earnest delivery of what he has prepared, the members of his congregation seem to have very hazy notions concerning the fundamental truths and great facts of their religion. This, alas! in many places is only too true. Wherein lies the blame? Far be it from me to assume to answer that question adequately. The suggestion is made, however, that perhaps the preacher has ignored another great principle of pedagogy, namely, that principle known as the principle of correlation.

Some preachers have attempted to ascertain how much of a certain sermon was grasped by the people; whether the salient points were apprehended. Such attempts have frequently resulted in humiliation to the preacher. Were others of his ministerial brethren to make similar experiments, chagrin would be a mild word to describe the result. Why is there such a lack of apprehension of the contents of even the best sermons on the part of the most intelligent hearers? Is it an indication that their intelligence has been overestimated? In some cases it may be so, but most frequently the fault lies in the preacher, who violates a third great principle of pedagogy, that known as the principle of concentration.

If the average pastor is so unfamiliar with the principles of pedagogy it would seem hopeless in attempting to persuade him to become the leader of his teachers in their study and application of these principles. But one of the aims of this series of lectures is to convince pastors of the great help that a knowledge of these principles will be to them in their own work. Once they have grasped, and have begun to apply them in their preaching and lecturing, the value thereof wil be so self-evident that they will go on to future study and experiment for themselves and become the inspirers and perhaps the leaders of their Bible school teachers in this most important science.

To do this requires first of all the willing mind. The pastor who realizes the need of the application of pedagogical principles to his own work and to that of his

Bible school teachers, must have as his first and chief preparation the willingness to be a leader in the study and application of these principles.

It is said that years ago when one of our great universities was a small college there was a vacancy in the department of geology. A young man applied for an appointment as instructor. He was asked if he knew much about the subject in which instruction was to be given. He replied that he did not, but that he was full of enthusiasm for the subject, that he was willing to study hard and to make experiments and that he knew sufficient to keep so far ahead of his class that he would be able to lead them. He obtained the coveted appointment. He lived up to his promises, making a first-class instructor because he was a fellow-student with the members of his classes. He knew enough to lead them and did not overlook the fact that they did not know very much geology. He afterwards became one of the most distinguished professors in his subject.

Is there not a hint here for those who would become leaders in the study of pedagogy in connection with the Bible school? Shall we not so seriously ponder this hint, that in the years to come our Bible schools will show the result of our acting upon it?

The definite question for our consideration in this lecture is: How shall the pastor lead his teachers in the study of religious pedagogy?

Suggestively, a sixfold answer is offered to this question:

I. THERE ARE GREAT FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF PEDAGOGY, WHICH ARE APPLICABLE TO RELIGIOUS WORK. Having accepted this statement as a fact, the pastor should make up his mind that he will grasp and apply these principles in his own work as a teacher and preacher. At first, he need not be concerned with many principles. A veteran, successful, day-school teacher once declared that all pedagogy might be comprehended in three principles. Many teachers of religious truths have accepted these three, and have found them admirable for a beginning. They are the three referred to in the foregoing, namely:

(1) The Principle of Apperception.

(2) The Principle of Correlation.

(3) The Principle of Concentration.

Beginning with the three and carefully considering the results of their proper application, the pastor will find himself greatly helped in his work and may become a great help to his Bible school teachers. From time to time, it will be very easy for him to make additions to his collection of principles, providing he has laid the foundation properly.

II. From the principles of pedagogy there may be deduced rules applicable to religious work. It must ever be borne in mind that a principle is always more important than any rule. At the same time, when the principle is understood, the rule or rules that are deduced from it may be very helpful.

John M. Gregory was at one time a day-school teacher, then a superintendent of public instruction, and afterwards a college president. As the result of his long experience in teaching, he formulated a series of laws which are as applicable in the Bible school as they are in the day school. These are known as

THE SEVEN LAWS OF TEACHING.

I. The Law of the Teacher.
   The teacher must know that which he would teach.

II. The Law of the Learner.
   The learner must attend with interest to the fact or truth to be learned.

III. The Law of the Language.
   The language used in teaching must be common to teacher and learner.

IV. The Law of the Lesson.
   The truth to be taught must be learned through truth already known.

V. The Law of the Teaching Process.
   Excite and direct the self-activities of the learner, and tell him nothing that he can learn himself.

VI. The Law of the Learning Process.
   The learner must reproduce in his own mind the truth to be acquired.

VII. The Law of Review.

The completion, test and confirmation of teaching must be made by reviews.

Any teacher who will paste a copy of these laws in his Bible, and from week to week test his methods of teaching by them, will gradually come to understand not only what mistakes he is making, but also how to overcome these mistakes. For example, a vast number of the mistakes made by our Bible school pupils may be traceable to the violation of Law III. on the part of our teachers. Many talk, and talk eloquently but produce small results because much of what they say is not understood.

III. PEDAGOGICAL PRINCIPLES MAY BE EXPLAINED AND ILLUSTRATED IN LANGUAGE UNDERSTOOD BY THE AVERAGE BIBLE SCHOOL TEACHER. Many scholars are so learned that it seems impossible for them to speak in the language of every-day life. They have vast funds of information but only a favored few have the benefit thereof, because of the methods by which attempts are made to convey it to others. Three teachers spent a week in examining two recent publications intended to help teachers. One was a two-volume work, written by a very learned man. The other was a small primer written by one not so learned. The verdict of the three teachers was—We have gotten more that is helpful out of the little primer than out of the two volumes. Why was this? Not because there was more in the primer, but because what it contained was put in such a way that the reader could easily understand it and make it his own.

Here is a field of almost limitless usefulness for the pastor. As he gets hold of great pedagogical truths and recognizes their value in his own work, he may so translate those truths that the youngest or least-educated teacher in his school will be able to understand their meaning. As a general thing the illustration will be of more value than the statement of the truth.

How few persons can get answers to their questions? The cause is frequently laid to the ignorance of the one questioned, whereas it is just as often the fault of the one asking the question. It will not be of much avail for the pastor to talk to his teachers about asking questions if he is not prepared to show by illustration what a good question is as well as to call attention to poor ones. Here

is a specimen of the sort of questions that should be avoided:

"Where is today's lesson found?" Then came the answers:

"In the Bible."

"In Acts."

"In the Book of Acts."

"Acts, eighteen."

"Acts, eighteenth chapter and twenty-fourth verse."

"In the twenty-fourth verse of the eighteenth chapter of Acts."

To the visitor in the back of the schoolroom this seemed bad enough, but much worse was the fault-finding of the superintendent, who did not seem to realize that this was just what he ought to expect.

What could he have done? He could have so framed his questions that there could have been but one correct answer to each one. Here are specimen questions and answers:

From what book of the Bible is today's lesson taken?

The Book of Acts.

From what chapter of Acts?

The eighteenth.

At what verse?

The twenty-fourth.

FOR PROPER QUESTIONING THERE ARE NEEDED

PREPARATION
PERSPICUITY
POINTEDNESS
PIQUANCY
PERSONALITY
PATIENCE
PERSEVERANCE
PRACTICE

Imagine a pastor taking a blackboard outline like the above and so mastering it that he can teach it to his Bible school workers, illustrating each point. Would he not derive great benefit himself? Would he not be greatly helping his teachers? This is a kind of pedagogy that is not only sensible, but also within the compass of every one who will use the brains with which God has endowed him.

IV. EXPERIMENTS IN PEDAGOGY SHOULD BE MADE IN THE BIBLE SCHOOL. Some may object to this statement on the score that the Bible school and the Lord's Day is neither the time nor the place for experiments. But consider how much experimentation is carried on all the time in our Bible school for no other reason than that our teachers do not know exactly what to do. From time to time, they try new plans, many of which have neither rhyme nor reason to support them. When a tried and approved principle is grasped or when a good rule has been evolved shall we not try it in order to ascertain how it will work? After being fairly tried, the results should be carefully noted and deduction made therefrom. This is the proper kind of experimentation. Let us see how it may be carried on in specific cases. There are many things which our study of humanity has led us to adopt as part of our working pedagogy. Recall some of the characteristics of your pupils:

(1) IMITATION. This trait is very strongly marked in our Primary pupils and is not altogether wanting in those who have long since been graduated from that department. What pedagogical value has our knowledge of the fact that our little ones are imitators? Emerson uttered not merely a pedagogical but a universal truth when he declared "What you are, speaks so loud that I can not hear what you say." Value! Who is able to estimate the value of this fact in our Bible school work, especially work among little children?

Is a teacher fussy, talkative, noisy, disorderly? In these things her pupils will imitate her not only within but also without, the walls of the class room.

Is a teacher quiet, self-composed, reverent? Then the power of imitation will lead the little ones in a very marked degree to be as she is.

Listen to a teacher leading in the recital of the Lord's Prayer. The pupils use almost exactly the same tone of voice that she employs.

Watch those children! They are playing Sunday school. Look carefully at their acting, and you can form a tolerably correct idea of how their teacher conducts her school service. Catch their leader's tone of voice, and you may imagine how the teacher uses her voice in the class room.

Do you want a child to do a certain thing? Do it yourself. Do you want a child to be a certain thing? Be it yourself.

You say, This is nothing new to us? Is this religious pedagogy? It is, and it is as old as the time of the great Teacher himself who taught his disciples, not so much by telling them what to do as by showing them what he was and how he acted. All we need is to have these simple, but everlastingly important, facts called to our attention in order to recognize their worth. Shall we not go farther while we put them in operation—inspire our teachers to experiment with them in the class room? Blessed is the Bible school which has a pastor who will lead his teachers in experimenting in pedagogy in order to better teaching.

(2) IMAGINATION. One of the most active powers of the child's mind from the standpoint of pedagogy is his imagination. For the teacher who knows the facts, the possibilities within her reach in this field are numberless. If she *sees* a picture, she can get the little ones to imagine that picture; so with facts or truths.

"Mother, there is a robber in the house."

"No, dear, there is not."

"Mother, I tell you there is a great, big robber in this house."

"You are mistaken; there is no robber here."

"But mother, there is a robber in this house.'

To soothe her little one the mother thought she would humor him, so she asked, "What does he look like?" Then followed a description of the robber so complete and so thrilling that the mother was alarmed. His size, his face, his clothing, his arms were all described so minutely that it semed as if the boy were looking at the robber as he spoke. At this juncture the father came in, and, as the mother, out of hearing of the boy, narrated the story and expressed her fears, he burst out laughing, as if the whole matter were a great joke. To his astonished wife he explained that on a bill-board not far from the house was the picture of a robber just such as the boy had described. With his vivid imagination aflame it was but natural that the picture should make a strong impression upon the little fellow and that he should bring it home.

Had he been accused of untruthfulness, he would have stuck to his story because he really saw that robber in the house.

Let a pastor understand what he can do with the imagination of a little child and he will have a lever for lifting that one into realms of knowledge with which he ought to be familiar. Led by the pastor the teacher may experiment until she, too, masters the secret of how to make use of her pupils' imagination in the impartation of biblical facts and spiritual truths.

(3) CURIOSITY. Any person who has had much to do with little children knows that curiosity is a very marked characteristic of their make-up. Indeed, it is reported on credible authority that there are persons nearer their second childhood than their first who have never gotten their curiosity fully satisfied. However, from the standpoint of the teacher, to know that the child is curious amounts to but very little unless one knows how to make use of that curiosity in the impartation of those things for which the Bible school stands.

I hand one of you young gentlemen a newspaper, saying, "There is something that will interest you." You take it, look at it, and then look at me. I ask, "What is the matter?" You respond, "This is last week's paper; I read it some days ago." Do I chide you for not wanting to read it again? No, indeed, I blame myself for being so stupid as to expect you to be interested in news a week old.

What frequently takes place in the Primary department? The teacher has a picture roll on which is some scene connected with the lesson of the day. Before the children arrive she very carefully exposes the roll to view, arranging the frame so that the picture will be visible to the largest possible number of pupils. They come in, one at a time, by twos and threes. They take their seats and, urged on by their curiosity, look at the picture. Because their receptive powers are strong, in a few minutes they take in all that they are able to get out of the picture. From time to time they glance at it, and each time it becomes less interesting to them because their curiosity concerning it has been satisfied.

It is the time for lesson study. Teacher turns to the

picture which means so much to her and to which she has given much study. She is surprised that the scholars are inattentive, that they do not seem to appreciate the picture. Her efforts to get them interested result in nothing but nerve wear and tear for herself. Wherein lies the difficulty? In the teacher, most assuredly. She has given the children last week's newspaper and they are not at all pleased with it. Long ago they had gotten out of the picture all they desired. Long ago they had discounted what she so earnestly tried to say. Can you blame these little ones?

Some one inquires, What should the teacher do? Banish the picture roll from the class room? By no means. She should make of it a most valuable adjunct to her teaching. In order to do this, she must understand that her pupils are curious, and that their curiosity may be made one of her strongest allies in teaching. Instead of exposing to the pupils' view the picture on the lesson for the day, she should take pains to let her pupils know that she is concealing something from them. This will sharpen their curiosity. If, as she ought to be, she is on good terms with them, one of them will come up to her and something like the following dialogue will take place:

"Have you got a picture there, teacher?"

"Yes, indeed."

"Is it a nice one?"

"Yes, it is a very fine picture. I think that you will be very much pleased to see it."

"Will you let me look at it?"

"Certainly; go to your seat, be a good boy, and bye and bye I will show you this beautiful picture."

The little fellow returns to his seat and informs the one next him that teacher has a nice picture and that she is going to show it to them soon. This information is passed to others and they fairly quiver with curiosity to know what the picture is. They wonder and speculate and the more they do so, the more anxious are they to see the picture.

The time for teaching arrives. After a few preliminary sentences tending to arouse further curiosity in the picture, the teacher exposes it, and while the curiosity

of the children directs to it not only their eyes but also their minds with absorbing interest, the story which it depicts is drawn and the lesson taught. Then the picture for that day has lost its value. It may afterwards be referred to very briefly for the purpose of recalling something in the minds of the children. Ah! fellow students of pedagogy, do we not realize the difference between last week's newspaper and the latest extra?

What is done with the picture roll may likewise be done with the blackboard objects, symbols, small pictures or anything else intended to attract and to hold the attention of the pupils. The pedagogical value of such materials is not so much in themselves as in the way in which they are employed. Do we not realize what possibilities lie within proper knowledge of, and the proper treatment of the curiosity of children?

V. The result of pedagogical experiments should be carefully considered and compared.

The pastor who is leading his teachers in experiments in pedagogy, having grasped the great truths connected with what may be done with the curiosity of children, gives his teachers a talk on the subject. Among his listeners is one who says, That is fine. I'll begin to appeal to the imagination of my boys. Accordingly she, during the week prepares herself and comes to her class on the Lord's Day conscious of her ability to apply what she has learned. She begins on her boys. They look at her and at one another stupidly. The stronger her appeals to their imagination, the less the effect produced. It would not be strange if one of the boys were to nudge his seat-mate in the ribs and say under his breath, "What's she giving us, anyhow?"

Discouraged, she goes home, and soon seeks an opportunity to tell her pastor that she tried what he advised in regard to making use of the imagination and that the attempt was a failure. A few questions by the intelligent, well informed pastor enables him to diagnose the case exactly. The following is a summary of what is said:

"How old are your boys?"

"They will average about eleven years of age."

"To whom was I talking about the pedagogical power of imagination, when you heard the address that made

you resolve to appeal to the imagination of your boys?"

"I thought you were talking to all the teachers."

"So I was, but I meant to impress the fact that the trait of imagination is of especial pedagogical value when instructing young children, especially those who are under nine years of age. Your boys are in the literal, matter-of-fact period, which is one of the marked characteristics of pupils of the Junior Department or of those between the ages of nine and twelve years."

Then the pastor comforts the teacher, gives her some points in reference to the method of teaching pupils of the age of those in her class, and she departs not only with more confidence than ever in her pastor, but also with a greater determination to be a better teacher.

Is there any more valuable work for the Master than this one of considering and comparing the results of pedagogical experiment, so as to be able to help his teachers in their work?

An ideal exercise would be for those gathered at a teachers' meeting to give to one another the results of experiments that they are making along certain pedagogical lines.

VI. A RECORD SHOULD BE KEPT OF THE RESULTS OBTAINED IN PEDAGOGICAL EXPERIMENTS. We all know how treacherous the memory is. It is well known that frequently the exception makes more impression upon the mind itself than does the rule. The teaching force of the school is constantly changing. For these and other reasons, it will be wise for the pastor, as he, in co-operation with his teachers, proves the value of a pedagogical principle, to make a record of that principle. So with rules that may be deduced from that principle. In a short time there would be gathered a series of principles the worth of which is understood by the teacher. These could be given to the young people who are being trained as teachers and to the new teachers entering the school, and by this simple method they could be kept from repeating the blunders of those who have gone before them. It is true that experience is our best teacher, but sensible is that one who is willing to profit by the experience of others.

One reason why such excellent work is done by teach-

ers in the Primary department is that they have learned the value of passing from one to another the results of what they have learned in their efforts to instruct the little ones. Let us take the hint from them. Let us keep a record of those things in pedagogy which we can mark "tried and approved," and let us turn this record over to each one in the congregation who is, or who may become a teacher.

If there is in the mind of any who are being addressed the slightest suspicion that all this is not biblical and in accord with the work of the true minister of Jesus Christ, I beseech you to study our Lord's methods as he approached various individuals. He was indeed the Master. He was a Master in his knowledge of humanity, for, we are told, he knew what was in man. More than this, he was in a pre-eminent degree a Master of Pedagogy. Although he never uses the term, his teachings give us the thing. Although apperception, correlation and concentration were words that were not current in his day, he taught according to the principles for which these words stand. Does any one doubt this? Let him study pedagogically the record of the Savior's interview with the woman of Samaria at the well. Note how the Great Teacher applied the principle of apperception in talking to the woman about something with which she was thoroughly familiar. Consider how he applied the principle of correlation by making everything she said contributory to the point that he wished to impress. That point was that he is the Christ. The principle of concentration was so well applied that the woman is led apparently without any effort on the part of the Master to accept his statement concerning the Christ: I that speak unto thee am he, and to go to her fellow townsmen and say, Come, see a man, who told me all things that ever I did: can this be the Christ?

Although the Bible is not a text book on either pyschology or pedagogy, it abounds in illustrations of the applications of the principles of both.

"My trouble," some one interposes, "is that I do not know how to get my teachers started in this great work of learning how to teach."

"My difficulty lies farther back than that," says anoth-

er. "I do not see with all that I have to do how I am going to find time in which to make myself either the inspirer or the leader in this most important line of effort."

For the benefit of both classes permit me to repeat a story. It is entitled:

MRS. BROWN'S LEMON-RAISIN PIES.

Mrs. Brown's aunt was a maker of lemon-raisin pies whose fame was county wide. Her niece asked for the recipe. She gave it, and Mrs. Brown made some pies which, while passable, were not to be compared to her aunt's. She got some information with the result that the next lot were a little better. She kept on experimenting and asking questions and talking with her friends about how to make lemon-raisin pies until now she is an expert. I was going to ask: Are pies of more value than boys and girls? Are pies of more value than boys and girls? but I will not, as you see the moral.

THE NATURE OF RELIGION.

BY REV. PROF. FRANCIS R. BEATTIE, PH. D., D. D., LL. D., OF LOUISVILLE PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

The most familiar and apparently simple things are often the most difficult to explain or clearly define. In regard to the familiar and universal fact of religion this is particularly the case. Most people have a more or less well defined idea of religion; and yet, scarcely any two persons will define it in precisely the same terms. This may be true even of those who are living under the power and experience of true religion. It is not an easy matter for even an earnest Christian to describe what the religion, whose power and hope he experiences, really consists in.

Then, if a wider view be taken, we find a great many different forms of religion extant among men. There are the various forms of pagan polytheism, the great ethnic systems of the Orient, and the faith of Islam. These are all spoken of as religions. Then there is Judaism and Christianity, and among Christians a variety of types, Greek, Roman and Protestant. Is there any common quality possessed by them all, which may enable us to define religion in some general way? And we sometimes speak of one man being a truly religious man, and of another being quite irreligious. Now, we naturally inquire, what it is that one of these men has that the other has not? How are we to conceive of religion amid all these varieties of it, and in this experience of its possession? What is the common quality?

And, further, when we read what various scholars have to say upon the subject, we find great diversity of opinion in regard to what is the essential nature of religion. This diversity expresses itself in the variety of definitons which these scholars give of religion. Cousin makes it mainly a matter of knowledge. Jacobi looked upon it as chiefly a faith exercise. Schleiermacher gave prominence to the feeling of dependence as the root of religion in the soul. Kant gave the chief place to conscience and

moral principles in it. Hegel associated it with the will, as perfect freedom. Amid all this diversity, the question at once arises as to the category under which we should construe religion. Is it cognition, or faith, or feeling, or morality, or does it imply a combination of all of these? It is evidently no easy matter to decide what the essential nature of religion really is, or what the underlying conditions of its experience are.

Nor do the Scriptures help us much towards getting a definite technical idea of religion. They usually take the common, popular conception of religion and simply assume its reality and power, just as they assume the existence of God, and of the spiritual factor in man. The Greek term *θρησκεία* used only a few times in the New Testament, does not aid us very much, for it is a somewhat general term, used to denote the reverent service of God. Paul, in Acts 26:5, uses this term when he speaks of the Jewish religion as *our religion.* Here he evidently has special reference to the ritual and laws of the Mosaic system, in which he had been reared. And James, in his epistle, 1:26, uses this term also, when he describes pure and undefiled *religion* as visiting the fatherless and the widows in their affliction and keeping oneself unspotted from the world. This describes the practical or philanthropic element of religion, as a service of God, through good done to our fellow men. The other Greek word, *κυνέω* which primarily means to fawn at one's feet as the dog at the feet of its master, as used in the New Testament, conveys the idea of humble reverence before God, and exalted regard for him as far above us. But the question of the essence of religion is not clearly expressed in these passages. Nor is much further light shed upon the question from a study of the Latin origin of the term religion itself. If it be taken from *relegere,* to gather up, or go over and carefully consider, or if it be derived from *religare,* to tie up or bind back, the question of the precise nature of religion is not settled clearly, for both of these ideas are implied in it. Religion requires us to carefully reflect on, and consider our relation and duty to God, and it equally implies that we are tied up to God by the bonds of moral obligation.

In addition, the fact that the exercise of religion has

sometimes been associated with some single faculty of man's constitution, has narrowed the view of what religion consists in. It may help to clearness of vision here, if we regard religion, on the subjective side, as the exercise of all the powers of the human soul, with the noblest objects about which they can be engaged. And the further fact that, in some cases, stress has been laid mainly on external truths, beliefs and rites pertaining to religion, and in others, attention has been turned chiefly to the experiences of the human soul in religion, has led to further confusion upon the subject, and has produced either narrow or one-sided views upon the whole question.

In seeking to define religion we may do well to keep in mind the fact that it calls into exercise, in the noblest possible way, all the complex powers of man. It is equally important to remember, also, that the objective and subjective aspects of religion must be carefully balanced in their relations with each other. Only by doing so can clearness and right view-point be secured.

What then is religion? What is its inner nature and essential principle? At root religion implies a relation between its object and its subject. The object of religion is Deity, conceived of in some way or other; and its subject is man, viewed in his whole personality. The relation between this subject and object is taken to be the fundamental fact in religion. It unites the subjective and objective factors in the proper way. Without God, as its abiding object, religion could not really be; and without man as its spiritual subject religion, so far as the human race is concerned, would have no reality. In greater or less degree this fundamental relation is common to all forms of religion, and in some sense it is the common quality of them all. The way in which this relation is conceived, and the degree in which it is realized by any company of men, will go far to determine the type of religion which prevails among them.

And not only must the reality of these two facts in their relations be taken into account in understanding the nature of religion, but the further fact that the relation between God, as the object of religion, and man, its subject, is capable of being realized, must be kept in mind. This implies on the part of the object of religion that the way

must be left open for self-communication and self-revelation on the part of that object to the subject, man. And, in turn, it further implies that there must be a capacity on the part of men to receive this revelation, and be affected by this communication on the part of the object to the subject in religion. Only under these conditions can the basal relation between God and man which religion involves be realized in an experience. Thus, as the basis of this relation, religion implies an activity on the part of God, its object, and an experience in the case of man, its subject.

Moreover, the Scriptures always assume this abiding relation. According to their teaching, God and man are so related to each other that as the object and subject of religion they stand in inherent organic relations with each other. And although sin has disrupted this relation it has not absolutely destroyed the fundamental bond betwen God and man. Hence, redemption, which is provided to restore this disrupted relation, has a real basis on which to effect its results. If the basal relation between man and God had been absolutely destroyed by the ravages of sin, redemption would not be possible.

From this view-point some definite idea of religion may now be obtained, if we keep diligently in mind that religion, as the basis of this relation, implies certain truths or facts concerning its object, and certain activities or experiences on the part of its subject. Four factors at least are apparent in the contents of religion.

First, religion is a mode of *knowing*. It calls into exercise the intellectual powers of men. The object of religion is in cognitive relations with its subject, and its subject has his powers of cognition brought into play thereby. There are certain truths concerning God which are capable of being known, and these, whether apprehended by reason or accepted from revelation, require intellectual activity on the part of man. This is the cognitive factor in religion.

Any view of the relation between God and man which puts them out of cognitive relation with each other is defective. Hence agnosticism, which denies the possibility of the knowledge of God on the part of man, is utterly invalid, and entirely destructive of religion. This does

not mean that the subject does or can fully know all the mysteries of the object of religion, but it does assert very earnestly that religion implies, on the part of the subject of it, a mode of knowing in regard to its object. On the basis of the fundamental relation already insisted on, religion is a mode of knowing by the subject concerning its object.

Secondly, religion is a mode of *believing*. This is the faith factor on which many lay so much stress. This faith factor is closely related to the cognitive element in religion, for they virtually imply each other. Thus the subject not only knows the object in religion, but believes that he is a real fact, and a living reality. The instinctive feeling of dependence is an essential factor in this element in religion. There is a deep-seated conviction in the subject of religion that he has some organic relation with its object, and is necessarily dependent on him for being and well-being.

This faith factor also comes into view in connection with the self-revelations which the object has been pleased to make for the subject in the matter of religion. This implies acceptance of the manifestations of God made in nature, in history, and in man's own constitution; and it relates very specially to the particular revelations, which for men, as apostate and sinful, God has been pleased to make, and place on record in Holy Scripture for them. Religion, on the basis of the fundamental relation between man and God, which it implies, calls faith into lively and constant exercise on the part of its subject. Hence, we conclude that religion is also a mode of believing.

Thirdly, religion is a mode of *feeling*. This in a sense is the emotional aspect of religion. It brings into play the highest affections and noblest sentiments of the subject of religion. In a measure this feeling is a movement of the sensibility which grows out of the knowledge and faith already described. As the mode of knowing and of believing implied in religion come into play, they necessarily stir the feelings with varied emotions. This feeling alone would have no religious significance, and might be pure superstition, but when coupled with knowledge and faith it has deep religious meaning. Here, again, the sense of dependence, the feeling of reverence and

the sentiment of devotion, all emerge. As the subject knows the object of religion, suitable sentiments are evoked, and as faith lays hold of the abiding realities of religion, kindred feelings are stirred into active exercise. Assuming the reality of knowledge and faith, feeling is a very important factor in religion. It takes very different forms in different religions, but it is always a component factor in religion. In Christianity feeling has its proper place. The heart as well as the head, the sensibility as well as the intellect, are called into play.

Fourthly, religion implies a mode of *acting*. It calls into play the active powers of its subject in their relation to the object of religion. The sphere of this action is that of conduct, and of regard for the will of God. This activity on the part of the subject of religion takes two forms, each of which plays a large part in the external aspects of religion.

This activity appears in certain acts of worship and forms of devotion, which express themselves in various religious rites and ceremonies. Praise, prayer and sacrifice are the main elements in this aspect of the active side of religion. Temples may be built, shrines made and altars erected in connection with these rites and ceremonies, or they may be quite simple in their nature. Here much of what makes up the external aspect of religion comes into view and many of those features which distinguish one religion from another, externally, are found in this aspect of religion. These rites and outward acts of devotion are evidences of the instinct of worship in the human soul, and they vary from the homage which the poor, untutored pagan gives to his fetich, up to the worship of the Christian, who worships a God who is a spirit in spirit and in truth. The instinct of worship, as expressed in these outward rites and forms, makes a very important element in the active side of religion. These religious acts on the part of the subject of religion are services rendered to its object. And they all imply the basal relation between the subject and object in religion on which it is important repeatedly to insist.

The other form in which this activity is impressed consists in the observance of moral duties which the subject feels bound to render to the object of religion. This con-

stitutes the ethical factor in religion, and it is a definite mode of acting. This factor necessarily has a large place in religion, though those who would make it the sum total of religion certainly go too far. Religion includes morality, but morality is not the whole of religion. The basis of this, again, is the organic relation between God and man, which constitutes the very condition of the possibility of religion.

The difference between natural morality and religious ethics here appears. Natural morality views our duties only in regard to ourselves and our fellow men. Ethics in the sphere of religion, and specially Christian ethics, regards our duties also in their relation to God. But into this inquiry we cannot further proceed. We mainly wish to bring out the fact that the ethical element is one phase of religion, as a mode of acting, in which all we ought to do is done as unto the Lord.

Thus religion implies an inner or organic relation between God and man. This bond is formed by virtue of God's creative act, in making man what he is, as a religious and moral being, and in setting him in the relations which he sustains to God. On this basis, and in the light of the discussion had, religion may now be defined. *Religion is a mode of knowing, of believing, of feeling, and of acting, which grows out of, and implies, an inherent and organic relation between God, its object, and man, its subject.*

But it is only in the Christian system that this fundamental relation is correctly expressed. And it is this system alone that gives the right interpretation of the perversion of this relation which sin has produced. The true mode of knowing, believing, feeling and acting on the part of the subject in relation to the object in religion is expressed only in the revelation which the Christian religion involves. And the way in which man's activity has been affected, and his relation modified by sin is correctly expressed only in the great pre-suppositions which the Gospel makes. The Holy Scriptures give the necessary knowledge concerning all these things. Hence, the Christian religion may be defined as a mode of knowing, believing, feeling and acting on the part of its subject in relation to its object, which is determined by the contents

of the revelation found in the Holy Scriptures, mediated by Jesus Christ, and vitalized by the Holy Spirit.

The Gospel is the divine remedy for the disruption of the relation between God and man. It restores this relation when it is accepted and acted on. This Gospel is mediated by Jesus Christ, rendered effective by the Holy Spirit, and is expressed in the Holy Scriptures. Hence, the Gospel conditions true religion in the case of sinful men. It becomes the power of God to every one that believeth. It is only when he comes under its potent sway, and into its precious experience that he finds it to be a divine power, and comes to know what true religion really is. Such a man is a really religious man for he is first of all in right relations with God, and, consequently, is right in his own heart, and right in relation to his fellow men.

BOOK REVIEWS.

The Theology of the Old Testament.

By the late A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D., Litt. D. Edited from the Author's Manuscripts by S. D. T. Salmond, D. D. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1904. Pages 553.

Whoever reads this volume carefully must approve Dr. Salmond's estimate in the preface: "Fine thinking, penetrating exegesis, spiritual vision, a rare insight into the nature and operation of Revelation, make the book one which the student of Old Testament Scripture will greatly value."

According to Dr. Davidson, "Old Testament theology is the earlier division of Biblical theology." "Biblical theology is the knowledge of God's great operation in introducing His kingdom among men, presented to our view exactly as it lies presented in the Bible." But what is the kingdom of God? What better definition can be found than this? "It is the fellowship of men with God and with one another in love." The perfect kingdom was not possible before the coming of the Son of God; but the Old Testament saints were members of God's kingdom, though in an imperfect form. What relation did the Old Testament dispensation bear to the perfect kingdom that was to be set up by the Son of God? "Thus the perfect kingdom was gradually prepared for by setting up such a kingdom in an imperfect state and under temporary forms, and by administering it in such a way as progressively to suggest to men's minds the true ideal of the kingdom, and communicate to them in broader streams the true life in such a kingdom."

In seeking for a point of view, Dr. Davidson says: "We do not go to the Old Testament with any general conception that it is the word of God spoken to us. We do not go to it with this conception, but we rise from it with this conception."

Dr. Davidson shows how certain studies must precede Old Testament Theology. Criticism is a handmaid to Theology, and "scientific exegesis of the literature in the length and breadth" must go before Theology.

Our author insists that the Old Testament Theology is a *historical* science, whose method of presentation should be *genetic,* since each succeeding truth rose out of a former truth. He cautions his readers against finding in the Old Testament the fully developed truths of the New. "The difference between the New and the Old is not that the same truths are not found in both, but that in the one the truths are found in a less degree of development than in the other. The Old Testament is as good authority for a truth as the New; only we must not go beyond the degree which the truth has yet reached in the Old Testament."

Dr. Davidson tells us how he was accustomed to divide the Old Testament history into a few periods: "(*a*) A preliminary or introductory period terminating with the Exodus.—The Old Testament religion hardly begins till the Exodus." Dr. Davidson regards the patriarchal period as the period of tradition, possibly religiously colored. "(*b*) The period from the Exodus to written prophecy, B. C. 800." To this period he assigns Judges, the Books of Samuel, the Book of the Covenant, and probably some Psalms and Proverbs. "(*c*) From 800, written prophecy, to 586, the Exile of Judah." To this period Dr. Davidson assigns Amos, Hosea, Micah, Isaiah and Jeremiah, also the Book of Deuteronomy. Without attempting to settle the exact date of the composition of Deuteronomy, he says: "This period of its discovery (621 B. C.) was that when its teaching really became a factor in the public life and the religious conceptions of the nation." "(*d*) From the Exile, 586, to 400, the close of the prophetical Canon." Of prophecy, Dr Davidson places in this period Ezekiel, Second Isaiah, Zechariah, Haggai and Malachi. Unlike some moderns, he does not scoff at those who ascribe to Isaiah the last twenty-seven chapters of the roll bearing his name. Our author also assigns the Levitical legislation to this period, along with most of the Psalter and much of the Wisdom literature, such as the Book of Job. "(*e*) From 400 to the Christian era.—This embraces: 1. Prophecy—Daniel; 2. Wisdom—Ecclesiastes; 3. History—Chronicles. This is the period of the Law."

Dr. Davidson was the ablest representative of the

mediating school of the second half of the nineteenth century. He would not accept all the critical results of the radical school, nor would he surrender much of the conservative theology. He made many concessions to the divisive critics that seem to some of us unnecessary, but he never learned the fine art of railing at his more conservative brethren who would not accept his dictum in matters of criticism.

Dr. Davidson first takes up the doctrine of God. He tells us that it never occurred to any writer of the Old Testament to prove the existence of God, for to do so would have seemed an absurdity; nor does the Old Testament speculate on how this knowledge that God *is* arises in the mind. "Its position is far in front of this. It teaches how God who is, is known, and is known to be what He is."

Revelation is a fundamental idea of the Old Testament. "If man has anything of God, he has received it from God, who communicates Himself in love and grace. The idea of man reaching to a knowledge or fellowship of God through his own efforts is wholly foreign to the Old Testament. God speaks, He appears; man listens and beholds." Dr. Davidson discusses the various theories as to the origin and signification of the different names for God. With some hesitation he accepts the ordinary view that El Shaddai means God Almighty, and El Elyon God Most High. "The singular of Elohim means probably *strength, power,* or *might,* and the plural merely intensifies this idea—the might *par excellence,* or the plenitude of might, is God." Referring to the view of Dozy that Abraham and Sarah were two stone deities of early Israel, and that of Von Hartmann that they represent the sun and the moon, and the notion of Kuenen that Saturn was the original object of Israel's worship, Dr. Davidson remarks: "These instances are sufficient to show the worth of attempts of this kind. There is absolutely no material, and the imagination has unlimited scope."

Prof. Davidson rejected the radical interpretation of the statement in Exodus, "I appeared unto the fathers as El Shaddai, but by my name Jahweh was I not known to them." He well says: "But this can hardly mean that the name was unknown, but only that its real sig-

nificance had never yet been experienced by them, and that God would manifest Himself fully in the character expressed by this name, which from henceforth became His name as God of Israel."

He prefers "I will be" as the reading of the Hebrew *ehyeh,* rather than the traditional "I am." He thinks this name Jahweh is almost equivalent to John's "he who is to come;" it promises a yet fuller manifestation of God's character and glory. He holds fast the view that the name expresses not God's essential nature, but His relation to Israel as the God of the covenant.

The question arises whether Israel's religion from the beginning was monotheistic. Many recent writers describe the religion of Moses and Samuel and David as national particularism or monolatry, that is the worship of but one God, although the objective existence of other gods was not denied. Our author thinks that the great prophets from Moses to the close of the Old Testament believed in the existence of no other God than Jehovah. He points to the fact that Christian writers, who do not for a moment believe in the existence of the heathen gods, yet refer to them in language which might be so construed.

Dr. Davidson is not afraid that God may turn out to be other than He has shown Himself to be in revelation. "He is the same as we know Him to be; only He is all that we know Him to be, heightened so as to exceed our reach of thinking."

Being a believer in supernatural revelation, Dr. Davidson taught that Moses and the early prophets had exalted conceptions of God, conceptions far above those entertained in heathen nations or even by the mass of the Israelites. Internal struggles with the idolaters in Israel and external conflicts with heathen peoples gave occasion for a fuller statement of the unity and spirituality of God by the later prophets, but their teaching was not a new doctrine of God. That Dr. Davidson believed firmly in supernatural revelation may be seen in the following ringing sentences: "The new elevation given by Moses to the idea of God cannot be regarded as anything but the result of a special revelation. God appeared to him. He did not reach a purer conception of God by

study or thought. God showed Himself to him."

As to the personality of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament, Dr. Davidson finds only the *beginning* of the distinction between the Lord and His Spirit. In general he puts the case as follows: "The 'Spirit of Jehovah' is Jehovah Himself *within* men, as the 'Angel of Jehovah' is Jehovah Himself *without* men." He holds that the Angel of Jehovah is not a created angel, but Jehovah Himself in the form of manifestation.

The author's treatment of the Divine attributes is exceedingly informing. He finds no antithesis in the Old Testament between Jehovah's righteousness and his mercy. "The exercise of grace, goodness, forgiveness may be called righteousness in God." The Old Testament teaches that God does according to His pleasure in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth; "but," says Dr. Davidson, "I think it is always assured that His pleasure is a benevolent and moral one, at least in the first instance, and that when it is otherwise this is due to the evil of men."

The prophets of the Old Testament, according to our author, speak of a righteousness of Jehovah which is not so much a Divine attribute as a Divine effect; "it is a condition of the earth, of mankind. It is Jehovah that brings it in; to bring it in is the goal of all His operations, and it is the final effect of them." "The antithesis which in dogmatics we are familiar with is a righteous or just God and *yet* a Saviour. The Old Testament puts it differently—a righteous God, and *therefore* a Saviour."

Lack of space forbids further quotations from this admirable volume; but enough has been given to whet the appetite of intelligent pastors for a seat at the banqueting board of the learned author. Dr. Salmond has wisely allowed the lectures to stand as he found them, although it is evident that they often overlap, and there is a good deal of repetition. Not all of the chapters were read before the same class, and the great teacher naturally introduced favorite topics in each course of lectures.

Dr. Davidson had the habit of going all around a subject, studying it from every point of view. Hence he seems at one time to lean toward one side of disputed questions and a little later to favor the opposite view. He was

careful and conscientious in the formation and the propagation of opinions and beliefs. He would not intentionally leave out a single fact from consideration nor overlook a single argument. Forty years of such painstaking research and strenuous thinking made possible the great book before us. We believe that Dr. Davidson made too many concessions to the divisive critics, thereby weakening his argument for the elevation and wealth of the Mosaic teaching concerning God and His Kingdom among men; but it would be a thousand pities for thoughtful pastors to refuse to read the book because of its critical position.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

A History of Preaching. From the Apostolic Fathers to the Great Reformers, A. D. 70–1572.

By Edwin Charles Dargan, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Homiletics in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. New York. A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1905. 8vo. pp. 577.

The publication of this volume marks the completion of one-third of a great undertaking—a project possible only to the acquirements of a scholar, supplemented by great courage and industry, and crowned by the blessing of a long life. This book proves that the author already possesses all these necessary gifts, except the last-named, and every reader will pray that the providence of God will not withhold that. It is perhaps not strange that so important a task has gone so long, not merely undone, but unattempted. Incidental treatment the subject has, of course, received in all histories of the progress of Christianity, but the subject is worthy of a separate and systematic treatment. The vastness of the field and the mass of materials has no doubt discouraged many, for a history of preaching is a *magnum opus* in more senses than one.

These abundant, almost superabundant, materials are very unequally distributed. Until we reach the period of the Reformation, the literature of the subject is painfully sparse—literature that really and specifically relates to *preaching*. A single library shelf will comfortably accommodate all the sermons that have come down to us from the first fifteen centuries. It is accordingly rather

a history of preachers, than a history of preaching, that must be attempted for this extensive period. Dr. Dargan has made the most of his sources, and if the reader of the first half of the book is a little disappointed by what is told, he has only to remind himself that there was no more to tell. The second half of the book has much to tell and the most is made of it.

The author divides his book into four periods. The first is concerned with preaching during the first four centuries. The fourth century was the time of Basil, the two Gregorys and Chrysostom, in the East; of Ambrose, Hilary and Augustine in the West. Our largest remains of ancient homiletic literature are from this century, and the chapter that discusses the characteristics of fourth century preaching leaves nothing to be desired. It shows a complete mastery of the surviving material, and acquaintance with the best modern criticism of it, as well as sound, independent judgment. Period II. is devoted to preaching from the fifth to the eleventh centuries inclusive—a time of decline in this, as in every other department of Christian life and effort. These were the Dark Ages of Europe, not so dark as they have been sometimes represented, but certainly a period of decline, of partial eclipse. The great missionary conquests made during this period, suggested by the names of Patrick, Augustine and Boniface, were probably not accompanied by any great amount of formal preaching; and neither the intelligence of the people nor the education of the clergy were equal to preaching of a high order during this entire time. No wonder the surviving literature is so scanty, and that the little that survives is valuable mainly as a curiosity.

The third period covers the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries inclusive. This is the period of Francis and Dominic, of Bernard of Clairvaux, of Tauler, and of the most dangerous heresies with which the Roman Church had to contend in all its history. These last are by no means the least important factor in the preaching of this age, and might well have received fuller treatment than the brief paragraph allotted to them on page 212. With few exceptions, however, this most interesting period is admirably treated, and the judgments expressed com-

mend themselves by their sanity, candor and moderation. It would be difficult, for example, to give a better account of Bernard in the same number of pages than Dr. Dargan has given us, and the account of Francis is equally good. Against the tendency to enlarge unduly upon favorite persons or themes, he has striven successfully, and nothing about the book is better (nor a more difficult achievement, we may add) than the admirable perspective maintained throughout.

In period iv. we come to the most important part of the book, preaching in the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, to which half of the entire volume is devoted. Materials become abundant, and the general interest of the great movement known in its earlier stage as the Renaissance, and in its later as the Reformation, of itself carries the reader along. Of the eight chapters into which this part of the work is divided, the first two are devoted to pre-Reformation preaching. The author's treatment of the mediaeval mystics is thoroughly satisfactory. A more difficult task was to treat within reasonable limits, yet adequately, the preaching of Wiclif, Hus and Savonarola, but this also has been done with good judgment, accuracy and spirit. The preaching of the sixteenth century is a most interesting theme, and much is made of the labors of the less conspicuous men of the time. Too often Luther overshadows everything in Germany, and Zwingli and Calvin completely eclipse all others. But here we see their due prominence given to men like Bugenhagen and Jonas in Germany, and Bullinger, Myconius and Farel in Switzerland. Nor is the preaching of the Anabaptists and other sects of the period neglected, but their part in spreading evangelical truth is properly, yet not unduly, emphasized. No one will fail to read the chapter on the preaching of the reformers in Switzerland and Scotland, and though here the author traverses well-beaten ground, he finds much to say that is fresh and suggestive, and succeeds in grouping well-known facts in new and telling combinations. The chapter on Roman Catholic preachers of the reformation period contains much that will be new to Protestant readers, most of whom have given little attention to this subject and know little about it.

Such defects as the book has are purely matters of detail, and quite unimportant. The general accuracy in dates, names and facts is remarkable, but in the handling of so vast a mass of materials it would indeed be surprising if a few errors had not crept in, for which one suspects the author is not himself always responsible, but rather the authorities on which he has relied. When, for example, Dr. Dargan says of Zwingli: "With shame and genuine contrition he mourned his few falls," (p. 403) it hardly agrees with Zwingli's letter to his friend Utinger (our source of knowledge), which is a decidedly flippant confession of his unchaste life. Into the sketch of Huebmaier, mostly excellent, several errors have crept. If the author had read the original document, he would hardly have called Huebmaier's recantation at Zurich "more apparent than real," but others have said this before him. It is not quite correct that the Anabaptist preacher "set up a printing press" at Nikolsburg; another Anabaptist, a Zurich printer, migrated to Nikolsburg and established himself in business there. Nor can we quite say that Huebmaier was condemned at Vienna, "bravely and immovably refusing to retract." He made a considerable retraction of his views. In fact, as at Turich, it is "impossible to acquit him of some insincerity and diplomacy." We said these were small matters—we have found no errors of a more important kind anywhere in the book.

And the merits of the book are many and great. The style is clear, flowing, readable always, eloquent frequently. The author's enthusiasm will inspire even a dull reader before he has gone far, and one who is fortunate enough to bring to the book an interest in its theme will read with growing delight to the end. One's only regret is, that one must wait some years for the contingetnly promised continuation.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

The Holy Spirit. Then and Now.

By E. H. Johnson, D.D., LL.D., Author of "An Outline of Systematic Theology," etc. Pages 308. Philadelphia. The Griffith & Rowland Press. 1904.

It is touching to note that this book is dedicated "to a

dear colleague," and to the author's wife, since deceased, "whose long illness illustrated the graces of the Spirit and whose companionship made this work a joy."

This is one of a few notable books on the Holy Spirit that have appeared lately, which represent a new method of approaching and treating the subject—a refreshing departure from the unscientific and ultra mystical methods of late years, especially those that are the outcome direct or indirect, of the Keswick and Northfield influences. The production of such a work required the equipment of a scholar, the illumination of a seer and that "religious use of the imagination," for which the author pleads in a masterly way elsewhere. He clearly shows here that what the Holy Spirit did in founding Christianity and what he still does for its furtherance, needs to be studiously looked into, that in the course of investigation there are questions of practical moment that arise, such as these: What is new in the new life? How does the Holy Spirit produce that newness and how witness to it and promote it? To what can the new life grow, and how may we hamper and baffle the Spirit, or how accept and use his help? By what tests may his teaching be sifted from one's own pet fancies, or even from the specious persuasions of the "father of lies?" The author deals with such questions in a frank, fearless fashion, as he does also with the doctrinal issues back of them, which in this age of searching inquiry into the origin of things, are reopened in many minds. For example: In what sense is the Holy Spirit personal? What of Old Testament usage and New Testament usage in their bearings on this question? How does the Holy Spirit operate upon the church or upon the individual? What difference is there between the ways of the Spirit's working in the different eras of Bible history and the ways of his working now?

He avowedly adopts the method of Biblical theology, in essence the historical method, in dealing with these questions, as the only method of inquiry entirely fair to the Bible, or safe to ourselves. He pursues the method in the main consistently, and at times to quite startling conclusions. For example, when Biblical theology, in its broad recognition of the fact that the divine revelation followed a human development, springs the "problem,

how much of a given teaching is from God and how much from man?" what, for instance, in Paul's ninth chapter of Romans is solid truth and what is but drapery of cloud, rising from the everywhere diffused Hebrew idea of God's sovereignty? it may impress us as a highly critical and hazardous way of theologizing; nevertheless, he insists, its validity cannot be denied, and the only safety is in following to the end the path it indicates. "We must," he says, "hold firmly to the dictum of the late Prof. George R. Bliss, that God's thought alone is the Bible." The doctrine of the Holy Spirit, especially, needs, he claims, "to be reviewed, possibly revised, and probably delimited by the unflinching and practically new processes of Biblical theology."

The results he achieves, while at points revolutionary, are everywhere worthy of study, especially on such subjects as the meaning of the word "spirit." the nature of inspiration, and the personality of the Holy Spirit, as viewed in the combined light of Scripture usage and teaching and modern psychology, as also in his dealing with the novel anti-mystical theory of Ritschl, and the late engaging attempt to explain Christianity "philosophically, yet evangelically," represented by the recent work of W. L. Walker, "The Spirit and the Incarnation."

GEORGE. B. EAGER.

The Tree in the Midst; A Contribution to the Study of Freedom.

By Greville Macdonald, M.D. Pp. xxviii., 411. New York, A. C. Armstrong; and London, Hodder & Stoughton.

A year ago Dr. Macdonald gave us *The Religious Sense in its Scientific Aspect* which was well received, in some quarters with great enthusiasm. That work bore decided marks of selfconsciousness and a studied style. These qualities have not wholly disappeared in this larger and far more important work, but they no longer objectionably obtrude themselves on the reader. Indeed the literary style of the present volume may be said to attain unto the best degree of that Scotch style which is at once the admiration and discouragement of so many. The clearness, vigor, and epigramatic character of the sentences are a constant fascination. And the publishers

have done their part in full accord with the author's excellence.

But chiefly of the matter. The author's sub-title tells us that he aims to make "a contribution to the study of freedom." It is evident that he has succeeded. An explanation of human freedom we can not here claim to find. Nor are there any radically new data in this contribution. There are new statements and new relations suggested. Some of these will need to be rejected, some to be modified and some pursued to legitimate conclusions.

Several outstanding characteristics call for review.

1. The main purpose is to find a place for all the facts of freedom in the theory of the universal application and validity of the laws of biological evolution, taking biological evolution as only the highest sphere of general evolution. It must be said that in seeking this end the author has not minimized the facts of freedom but has sought to do them full justice. If place can be found in evolution for the whole spiritual nature of man with its aspirations, its strivings, its highest conceivable destiny then will that theory hold the field. The growing recognition of the Theistic principle in evolutionary theories and the gradual modification of these theories to comprehend the larger facts are doing much to abate the antagonism to the theories and to enhance their general plausibility.

So far there remain several epoch-making stages of evolution at which new forces manifest themselves. And in each case the new epoch differs from the old not quantitatively alone but qualitatively as well. It is not a question of how much the lowest form of living matter differs from the highest form of dead matter. The question rather is, how does it differ. And not yet has an answer been given that can negative the presence of an entirely new factor. So also of the stages at which appear consciousness, conscience, and spiritual life. Macdonald undertakes by repeated uses of the analogy of the oak and the acorn to show that all that comes out in the development of the life was present in the embryonic germ. Herein he is in accord with the present evolutionary trend. This view is now quite generally admitted to demand for its ultimate basis the Theistic principle. But

it must seem far from conclusive that God would have held in undeveloped embryo the seed of all spiritual life for countless ages, during which the lower forms of life were developing from the primordial germ. Surely there is no final reason why He might not just as well have introduced a new factor at the stage of evolution at which it is to begin its work. Macdonald yields no plausibility to that theory which holds to the natural evolution of man's physical being and consciousness but which contends that the spirit of man was a new inbreathing of God in accordance with the Genesis account.

There are so far two serious objections to the thoroughgoing application of the evolution theory for the production of man in all that he is and is to be.

In the first place, it involves the application of the same laws to physical and spiritual life. This is the recognized defect of Henry Drummond's great work. Macdonald seeks to anticipate this objection by a full discussion of analogy in its two uses of illustration and proof; but he seems to fail to make out his case.

In the second place, two fundamental Christian doctrines lie across the path of the Christian thinker when he heads toward this complete evolution, namely the fall of man and the deity of Jesus Christ. I am aware that I shall be charged with being traditional and unscientific in holding that these are fundamental Christian doctrians. None the less is the case so, as it appears to me. It seems not impossible that an adjustment might be had between the theory of the fall and the doctrine of evolution. But none appears in the other case.

A third objection, metaphysical in its character, might be mentioned; the high destiny of man—ultimate, full fellowship with his Maker — does not seem consonant with the view that his Father left him in the protoplasm of ages past and shall see him face to face only in the consummation of ages hence.

2. Macdonald's primal and primary prophet is Heraclitus and his message is "There is no Being but in Becoming." This he applies in a sense far wider and deeper than that of his teacher and in a sense which is essentially true. Heraclitus however hardly deserves all the credit of teaching the thought of the ages this great principle.

In accordance with what has been said above, Macdonald also insists, with frequent reiteration, on two other principles; no direct creation, and no paradox. These two principles are really at bottom one, and are one with the author's understanding of the dictum of Heraclitus. This he recognizes. There is no occasion to quarrel with these principles. There is room for much difference as to their application.

3. The Introduction and Chapter II. contain the best vindication that has come to my observation of the place of the spiritual in any true system of philosophy or religion. The poet and the philosopher reach and proclaim ever the deeper truth and meaning of existence. The scientist is concerned with facts. The truth lies back of these. It ever remains that the things which are seen are temporary, while the unseen things, open to those who fear not the wonderful, are eternal. "The mere man of science looks upon the unknown as opportunity for conflict. He attacks it with might and main and kills the wonder of it that he may assign it a proper place in his graveyard of information." "We know well what the men of science have done for us but the true service of the prophet and poet is less readily realized." The trinity of worship in our day are historical study, scientific analysis, and progress; and they are all interpreted chiefly in the realm of the physical. History and science show us only what has been and what is: man needs evermore that which shall be, and here religion, life, art, and philosophy find place. It is a great advance in the last few years that so many prophets are arising to contend for the ideal. Newman Smyth in his Through Science to Faith, Veda Scudder in her Life of The Spirit in Modern English Poets, Wilkin in his Control in Evolution, James in his Varieties of Religious Experience are, in their way, some of the successors of Henry Drummond. And Macdonald must now take rank with this rapidly growing school that is doing so much to vindicate the spirit as a source of knowledge as over against the exclusive reign of the intellect in the modern scientific age. Our author's classification of experiences under the heads egoism, altruism, transcendentalism may be open to some objection, but it sets forth the essential facts and

puts the emphasis of value correctly. For this great service the volume is eminently worth while.

4. We have now arrived at the heart of the discussion and the explanation of the title. The account of the Garden of Eden our author takes for a legend. *The Tree in the Midst* bearing the fruit of the knowledge of good and evil constitutes the condition of Adam's entrance upon a moral life with ethical distinctions. The Creator intended that Adam should violate the command not to eat of this tree. In this act of insubordination he became conscious of the power of self-determination. It was the rising above complacent, nonprogressive acceptance of an easy environment and the entrance upon a conscious struggle with the thorns and thistles of sorrow and suffering. In this struggle man constantly enlarges the scope of his freedom and its reality. The name of the forbidden tree gives color to this theory as does the reason assigned for banishing man from the Garden. For how could man lead a moral life without the consciousness of moral distinction? Our author however is very far from making a virtue of disobedience. He draws a sharp distinction which he applies with great skill and thoroughness between insubordination to hereditary environment and disobedience to the laws of one's being. When he says that in time the prohibition to eat of The Tree in the Midst would have been withdrawn, there is no valid reason for questioning the view. But is it not just in this fact that we find man's violation of the command to be disobedience rather than insubordination? Nor can it be successfully maintained that moral development is possible only in revolt from one's environment. Had Adam developed his self-consciousness and self-determination in the discharge of the ethically indifferent duties enjoined in Genesis 1: 28, he might speedily have arrived at the point where he could receive from the Creator the gift of moral freedom. And in this case the gift would still be such as our author contends it must, namely that of acquiring ethical and spiritual character. It is not necessary that man have an entirely new environment in order to come into a *modus crescendi.* It is not an antithesis between making "the best of our restrictions" and building "wider limits for our roaming."

This reference to Holmes' Pearly Nautilus does not serve the argument, for the tortoise may grow his larger shell only if he accepts in their place the limitations of the smaller.

5. Let no one conclude that the eschewing of paradox and the magnifying of insubordination by our author carry with them the denial of sin and the minimizing of evil. He is very far from this even though he does make man the author of evil and the creator of the Devil. And yet it does look a little insufficient when he says, "But we may for the present dismiss the point by affirming that *whatever is, is right until something better becomes possible*, when the 'whatever is' immediately becoms wrong. And this is the whole essence of that mystery of Evil which has been the sorrow of the thoughtful since all time." Fuller light is thrown on this theory of evil in his discussion of the law of Perfection, Compromise and Competition, Inheritance and Wage. The last three chapters, bearing these titles, make the practical application of the whole discussion.

The conclusion is hardly commensurate with the splendid place assigned to the transcendental in the opening chapters. We come upon the outstanding questions of freedom, Whence? and Whither? A more definite answer would seem to be justified than the following: "If our freedom has not answered its Whence it is surely weaving its Whither. Man has not yet justified his inheritance by his wages; but the possibility of better work remains. And for our peace and hope, it is given us still to ask the questions which the revelations of the evolving universe are forever answering—Whence is our inheritance? Whence is the seed?" Dr. Macdonald has not fully solved the question of freedom. He has made a contribution toward its solution. Yet, its ultimate solution is not likely to lie in the direction of his interpretation of Adam's violation of the divine command.

W. O. Carver.

Die Psalmen übersetzt und erklärt von D. Friederich Baethgen.

Dritte neube-arbeitete Auflage. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Gottingen. 1904.

Baethgen's Commentary on the Psalms is one of the most popular volumes in the Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, edited by Prof. W. Nowack, of Strassburg. The third edition gives evidence of a careful study of the newer books on Hebrew Poetry, such as H. Grimme's Abriss der bibl. Metrik and E. Sievers' Studien zur hebr. Metrik.

Looking at Baethgen's Commentary as a whole, we note with pleasure its perspicuous style, the undisguised admiration for the poetic beauty and moral elevation of the Psalms, and the strong protests against the extreme radical criticism. Baethgen does not equal Delitzsch in spiritual insight and fervor, nor can he approach Ewald in setting forth the literary beauty of the Hebrew poetry; but he is reverent, sane and conscientious. No one can call in question his learning or his disposition to front all the facts.

As a critic, Baethgen stands midway between the radicals like Wellhausen and Cheyne and thoroughly conservative scholars like Keil and Wm. Henry Green. In Germany he would be classed with the progressive conservatives.

The question in advanced critical circles of late years has been not, Is David the chief author in the Psalter? but rather, Are any of the Psalms pre-exilic? Duhm and Cheyne place all the Psalms in our present collection in the exilic and post-exilic periods. Baethgen agrees that much more than half of the Psalter belongs to the period after the Babylonian exile (587 B. C.); but he contends that perhaps thirty to forty psalms belong to the period before the kingdom of Judah perished. Psalm 18 he ascribes to David, though not in its present form. "Also in Psalms 3 and 4 much speaks in favor of Davidic authorship," says Baethgen; but Psalms 7, 8, 11 and 19, which Ewald and Hitzig ascribed to David, he places in later times. He locates Psalms 20, 21, 61 and 63 with confidence in the period during which Israel had a king on the throne.

Baethgen holds that our present Psalter contains a Davidic Psalm-book (1-41), a second collection of hymns partly pre-exilic and partly exilic and post-exilic (42-89), and a third collection (90-150), all of which belong to the period after the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B. C. He understands the title "to David" not as indicating the authorship of individual psalms, but as showing the collection from which the psalm was taken. As the earliest and most famous of the psalmists, David gave his name to a miscellaneous collection of early psalms, most of which were composed by other men.

Baethgen thinks that the three divisions of the Psalter had already been merged into one book when the author of Chronicles composed his history of Judah. He agrees with many other scholars in placing the Chronicles a little before 300 B. C. Baethgen is careful to say, however, that the Psalter was not closed against further additions; for he assigns a few psalms to the Maccabean period. But he thinks Olshausen and Duhm are far astray when they assign to the period of the Maccabees the greater part of the Psalter.

Baethgen shows rare skill in psychological interpretation. He knows how to put himself into intellectual sympathy with the unknown singer. Seldom does he venture to identify positively the author, but almost always he interprets with skill his thoughts and emotions.

Sievers' Studies in Hebrew Metre have profoundly influenced Baethgen's conceptions of the forms of Hebrew poetry. Accent, rather than the number of syllables, determines everything. So sure of his ground is Baethgen that he tries in many places to correct the present Hebrew text by his laws of accentuation. In applying metre to correct the text he omits words oftener than he adds them. He has little faith in the ability of modern scholars to supply the lacunae in an ancient text.

Baethgen makes much use of the Septuagint and other ancient versions both in textual criticism and in exegesis. His commentary is not filled with lists of modern scholars arrayed on opposite sides of some minor question of text or interpretation. This by no means implies that he is unfamiliar with the best recent literature on the Psalms, but only that he takes his readers to the sources,

and works out by the aid of these his text and its interpretation. When our author meets a grammatical difficulty he tries to solve it in a thoroughgoing way. He well says: "The much-used method of newer expositors, to displace every uncommon grammatical expression with that which is regular, is a thoroughly uncritical procedure." He thinks we ought to try to understand an author before we proceed to correct him. He insists that the assertion that the text of the Psalms has been so corrupted that it often contains "pure nonsense," is a decided exaggeration.

Baethgen's translation of the Psalter and his grammatical exegesis are scholarly and suggestive. He is at home in Hebrew Exegesis.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Science and Immortality.

By William Osler, M.D., F.R.S., Professor of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston and New York.

This is the Harvard University "Ingersoll Lecture," for 1904. This lecture is cast in the mould of much learning though not chiefly of the scientific sort. Its literary style is replete with metaphor, unusual in sentence construction, full of reference to, and fragmentary quotation from, many sources. There seems all through to be a self-consciousness that fears to overstep the limits set by agnostic science while at the same time it cannot but feel that immortality is true and of tremendous importance. The total effect is of a man who must be scientific, according to the standards, but dares not, for he knows the truth though he falters at its certainty. There is the impression of a man in the currents of conflicting thought which he carefully analyzes but in which he has no anchorage even though he feels the dragging of the anchor assuring him that the sea is not fathomless.

The lecture is not less interesting for being different from the promise of its title. It is really an analysis of the present day attitude, general as well as scientific, toward immortality. The author finds three classes: "While accepting a belief in immortality and accepting the phases and forms of the prevailing religion, an immense majority live practically uninfluenced by it, except

in so far as it ministers to a wholesale dissonance between the inner and the outer life, and diffuses an atmosphere of general insincerity''—a statement containing all too much of truth and yet one must think exaggerated in both quality and quantity. It is a scholastic deliverance. ''A second group, larger, perhaps, to-day than ever before in history, put the supernatural altogether out of man's life, and regard the hereafter as one of the many inventions he has sought out for himself''—a true characterization, only it should be noted that there is now a trend away from this view, a trend that is rather seeking its whither, as yet.

''A third group, ever small and select, lay hold with the anchor of faith upon eternal life as the controlling influence in this one'' which again is true except in so far as it may imply that a selfish desire for personal immortality is the dominant characteristic in this class.

Our author has a pretty conceit for naming these classes: the first are Laodiceans, because ''lukewarm,'' ''concerned less with the future life than with the price of beef or coal.'' The second class are Gallionians because ''they care for none of these things.'' Last we have the Teresians, which name must be explained by a note concerning Saint Teresa.

In the discussion of the Gallionians we enter the scientific field in which there are ''four points of contact with a belief in immortality:'' 1. There is a general change of attitude due to biological evolution and to Higher Criticism of the Bible. 2. '' Modern psychological science dispenses altogether with the soul.'' 3. We find ''the futile search of science for the spirits.'' 4. ''* * science has put on an immortality of the flesh in the morphological continuity of the germ plasm'' which issues in the theory that ''the individual organism is transient.'' Here we have, correctly stated, the points of contact of science with the belief in immortality, but a mere statement, and in a form suggesting a negation by science of the belief such as does not do justice to the situation.

The conclusion is pathetic in its pessimism, and quite as much so in its gleam of hope. While he thinks all young men who study must wander far from the simple faith and most find their place among the Laodiceans and

Gallionians he hopes that "some" will "come at last * * to the opinion of Cicero, who had rather be mistaken with Plato than to be right with those who deny altogether the lips after death; and this is my own *confessio fidei.*"

W. O. Carver.

Matthew Arnold and His Relation to the Thought of Our Time. An Appreciation and a Criticism. By William Harbutt Dawson. G. P. Putnams' Sons. New York. 1904.

This brilliant interpretation of Matthew Arnold is by a man who has already made a wide reputation by various works on German socialism. This study of the great English critic is in the interest of the same ideas. The author is an ardent admirer of his hero as will be seen from the opening sentences of the preface. He says, "There is to-day a cult of Matthew Arnold; it is growing; it must grow. . . . To show what this cult is and why it must prevail is the purpose of this book. Briefly, the cult of Matthew Arnold is the cult of *idealism,* using the word not, of course, in its philosophical meaning, but as indicating the pursuit of perfection as the worthiest working principle of life."

He treats the work of Arnold under the three heads of *culture, religion* and *politics.* Under the head of *culture* the author expounds "Arnold's Philosophy of Life," his conception of "The Mission of Culture," his comparison of "Hellenism and Hebraism," his treatment of "The Three Estates" and "Public Education." The author believes that Arnold's epigrammatic style has hindered his influence. People easily remember his striking sentences, but for that reason neglect and forget his books, p. 30; he admits that this "apostle of sweetness and light" was often too testy, that this critic of dogma was always excessively dogmatic, that this prophet of social and political reform could never be induced to take part in practical movements for reform, p. 61f., that this censor of pretense was adorned by an "unaffected literary vanity," p. 96. Arnold was above all things a preacher of culture as a panacea of all the ills flesh is heir to, and following his footsteps our author takes occasion to unbosom himself with some warmth concerning existing conditions in England. Religiously things are awry both

in the Establishment and among the Non-conformist churches; "in art and letters the same picture is offered of unwholesome eccentricity and unbridled license. . . . 'Art for art's sake' is the device of modern realism, and the plea is held to justify everything that is crude, grotesque, and abnormal. Fiction, too, goes to nature for its studies, but nature in its wildest and most lawless moods; . . of old the hog had his stye and was kept there; to-day he may ramble through the library, and even in my lady's boudoir. . . . To-day the air is full of the cry and clamor of so-called modernity. That a thing be modern excuses everything—every vagary, every extravagance, every riot of the imagination, every eccentricity of action," pp. 69f. All this is in the mind of the author due to a riotous individualism. Socialism and Arnold's emphasis on culture are the remedies.

Arnold regarded the middle classes of England as among the poorest educated of the leading nations of the world, because it was left too largely to individual initiative. He urged the retention of the classical studies, especially Greek as teaching beauty, and did not believe that real education was possible without them.

The author is not proud of Arnold's work in the realm of theology. He says, p. 155: "To Matthew Arnold's theological writings I come, candidly, with but a mitigated sympathy, believing them to be on the whole the least necessary and the least serviceable part of his literary work . . . And yet, while these writings failed entirely to achieve the purposes for which they were immediately undertaken, and while the purposes themselves seemed to have acquired in Arnold's mind an importance and an urgency which it is nowadays difficult to appreciate, the reservation is due that much of his religious speculation possesses considerable incidental value." This is faint praise from an ardent admirer. The author admits that it is rather incongruous that a man of letters should enter the field as a protagonist of rationalistic theology, and yet he devotes large space to the exposition of Arnold's views. He maintains that Arnold's revolt is not against religion but against theology. After a full exposition of Arnold's religious views and evaporating criticism of current religious conceptions he proceeds to their crit-

icism; and here shows admirably the inadequacy of Arnold's views. Arnold held that the Hebrew conception of God was that of a "Power that makes for righteousness." Of his arguments the author says, p. 231, "The most obvious comment . . . is that his argument here is not merely inconclusive, it is not even persuasive." Arnold picked and chose his texts at will, so as to suit his own case, in a method that was neither scientific nor judicial, nor, let it be added, literary," p. 232. "Arnold contends that the Bible should be criticised as every other book is criticised, yet in fact he criticises it as he would have criticised no other historical book. . . . To pretend that this conception represents unmistakably the ideal and intent of Israel is to make a claim which no fair weighing of evidence, no impartial reading of history no true understanding of the workings of history will support," p. 240. The author maintains that Arnold's conception of God and religion was at least as metaphysical as the one he discarded, that its adoption would be disastrous to popular religion. His attitude is due to his ignorance of man, especially the masses whom he professed to love but never touched, and to his characteristic lack of precision when discussing philosophical questions." The author's conclusion is, "The man who is able to receive, and live by, the religion which Arnold offers him is no longer in need of its help and stimulus," p. 256. "It will fail because it possesses no initial power; it may preserve, but it cannot build up," p. 257.

With Arnold's criticism of miracles and certain phases of Christian doctrine the author shows more sympathy; and yet more with his criticism of the churches, Established and Non-conforming. Still he offers criticism here. If there is to be a recrudescence of Arnold it is well that we have this brilliant and searching criticism of his views from so ardent an admirer. W. J. McGlothlin.

Lux Mundi: A Series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation.

Edited by Charles Gore, M.A., Canon of Westminster. Twelfth Edition. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House. Pp. lx. and 452. Cloth, $1.40 net.

The following extract from the preface explains the origin and subject of this now famous book.

"This volume is primarily due to a set of circumstances which exist no longer. The writers found themselves together at Oxford between the years 1875-1885, engaged in the common work of university education, and compelled, for their own sake no less than that of others, to attempt to put the Catholic faith into its right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems. Such common necessity and effort led to not infrequent meetings, in which a common body of thought and sentiment and a common method of commending the faith to the acceptance of others, tended to form itself. We, who once enjoyed this happy companionship, are now for the most part separated. But at least some result of our temporary association remains which, it is hoped, may justify and explain the present volume."

"We have written," they add, "not as 'guessers at truth' but as servants of the Catholic Creed and Church, aiming only at interpreting the faith we have received—yet with the conviction that the epoch in which we live is one of profound transformation, intellectual and social, abounding in new needs, new points of view, new questions, and certain therefore to involve great changes in the outlying departments of theology, where it is linked to other sciences, and to necessitate some general restatement of its claim and meaning."

The aim, therefore, is to succor a faith distressed by the problems raised by "the modern growth of knowledge, scientific, historical, biblical;" problems moral, intellectual, political, ethical. This is to be done "not by compromise—for compromise generally means tampering with principle—but readjustment, or fresh correlation of the things of faith and the things of knowledge."

The twelve essays are from eleven different pens and deal with the following topics: "Faith;" "The Christian Doctrine of God;" "The Problem of Pain;" "The Preparation in History for Christ;" "The Incarnation in Relation to Development;" "The Incarnation as the Basis of Dogma;" "The Atonement;" "The Holy Spirit and Inspiration;" "The Church;" "Sacraments;" "Christianity and Politics;" "Christian Ethics." The first appendix is an addendum on "Some Aspects of Christian

Duty;" the second, a sermon on "The Christian Doctrine of Sin."

That the demand for some such work was not overestimated seems proved by the fact that while the first preface bears the date "Michaelmas, 1889," that to the tenth edition is dated "July, 1900."

The new knowledge, of which the author speaks, gathers around the evolutionary hypothesis and its various applications. The authors accept it and have satisfied themselves that so far from undermining faith in the Church and its Creed, the new view of the world confirms and enriches it. They are quite sure, at the same time, that some of the dogma of theology—not the central as contained in the Creed, but the outlying ones on which the Church has not formally pronounced—must be either modified or abandoned. They are not, however, so committed to evolution that they and their teaching must stand or fall with it. They admit—nay, one of them even expects—that it may some day be superseded, but such a possibility they survey with comparative unconcern, convinced that no actually demonstrated knowledge will ever conflict with the teachings of Christianity as found in the Bible and formulated by the Church.

The object is a worthy one. To disentangle revealed truth from theories, scientific, philosophical or theological, with which it is not identified, to permit unnecessary conflicts with science or philosophy and so allay alarm, to do this is to promote freedom and independence in men's thinking and to render a genuine service, not for to-day but for to-morrow also.

The spirit in which the essayists approach their task is admirable. It is reverent, believing, earnest. They are scholars, as you might expect. Their thought is fresh and vigorous, their style graceful and clear. They are not skeptics, much less are they destructive critics. At least they do not mean to be. As loyal Churchmen, they hold steadfastly to the Church Creed. Whatever suspicions one may have of the tendency of their teaching on Inspiration, and many feel that it inevitably leads toward Unitarianism—they certainly are not Unitarian. It is expressly repudiated. The deity of Christ is asserted in the most emphatic terms. And Mr. Moberly shows that

that doctrine resting on the certain fact of His actual resurrection from the dead practically carries with it, at least the full contents of the Apostle's Creed. And whether one agrees with him or not Canon Gore's object in the essay on Inspiration is not to undermine the authority of Scripture, but to show a standpoint for asserting it, in full view of what some of the critics are saying and so calm the fears of faith and hold to it wavering souls. The Holy Scriptures are "the highest expression of the mind of Christ," "the undying type of apostolic teaching," "an undying fountain of life from which the water of pure doctrine can be drawn," and by which "tradition and development can always be checked." So they are "the ultimate authority." Notwithstanding their attitude to evolution, they believe in the reality of the Fall, recognize the influence of degeneracy in religion, and, what is specially gratifying, have not the slightest doubt about the finality of Christianity. Their conception of the person of Christ and of our relation to Him settles that. When present social problems, such as the struggle between capital and labor, are faced, solution is wisely sought along the lines of personal responsibility and actualized brotherhood.

Nor is the reader impressed with the idea that these men are dealing with Christian truth in a coldly intellectual or purely external fashion. Their repeated references to human sin and helplessness and the oft-expressed conviction that only divine grace can meet our need and save, make one feel that they know by experience the central truth of the Gospel. The book pulses with spiritual life. The Christian temper and spirit in its humility and hope are manifestly present.

As one notes such facts he is amazed at some of the charges which have been made against the author. One critic, for example, has it that they deny both the personality and transcendence of God, whereas Christianity is defined as "a personal relation of trust in a personal God," and the statement is made that "Religion demands as the very condition of its existence, a God who transcends the universe." It would be easy and pleasant to multiply quotations on these and other points equally satisfactory and refreshing. The fact is there is a goodly

body of doctrine and experience which the writers believe and know and which they seek to expound and defend.

Why then the fusilade of criticism which has been directed against the book? Is it all as unwarranted as that just referred to? By no means. When a company of High Churchmen undertake to harmonize their Creed with the evolutionary thoughts of the day we may expect to meet statements in both directions that will call forth dissent. And so it is.

The title and, especially, the sub-title are enough to cause suspicion. When the death of Christ is regarded as incidental and subordinate to the incarnation, we may well distrust the system of which that is practically a key-note. Whether the incarnation would have taken place had there been no Fall, is, at best, a speculation. Certainly there is nothing in the Bible that teaches it. On the contrary apostolic emphasis is on the death of Christ. Even the Gospels treat the birth very scantily, and give a very large proportion of their space to the events that cluster around the Cross. This, in our judgment, is the first great weakness of the book—making that fundamental which not only lacks positive Biblical support, but puts your thinking out of the Bible perspective.

The effect is seen, for example, in the treatment of the Atonement. Admirable as it is in many respects, it fails to do justice to the cry, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" and to Paul's strong expression, "He made Him who knew no sin to become sin for us." And just because his view is inadequate, Mr. Lyttleton can say, "The atonement undoubtedly transgresses the strict law of retribution;" and Mr. Moore can speak of "the forensic fiction of substitution" and "awful and immoral system of Calvinism." We are not inclined to make light of the various theories of the atonement that have been propounded. There is probably something of truth in each of them. They come far short, any or all of them, of exhausting its fulness. But of one thing the common man may be sure—that the Biblical view does give substitution as practically the heart of it and Paul's language as well as the Saviour's cry suggest depths too deep for our poor words, more awful than most theories assume. Many a sin-burdened soul, all crushed with the sense of sin, has

caught some glimpse of his own need and God's demand, and has found rest in God's righteous grace as it has gazed into the abyss into which that phrase, "become sin," seemed to open.

Similarly we cannot but feel that Canon Gore's doctrine of sin is too shallow, when he assures us that "there is no positively sinful nature," that sin is "not nature, but failure or disorder of will." If the nature be right, why this universality of sinning? Through inherited tendency as the Canon implies? But in what does the tendency inhere? And is there any way of restoring the disordered will except through the new birth?

Of a piece with this is Canon Holland's dictum that "we are all equally sons of God." With him faith is the response of sonship and the deepest thing in us. The discussion is much improved in an addendum in the fourth edition when he assures us that on account of the incoming of sin that response is impossible apart from the enabling act of the Holy Spirit. It becomes then a question of the wisdom of using the term son to indicate our natural relation to God. To that the Bible gives little countenance.

We might expect to see frequent indications of the influence of evolution on the theology of these essays. It is quite marked, for instance, in Mr. Illingworth's reference to "the rash orthodoxy that is over eager to accept any result that tallies with its own preconceived opinions, as, for instance, the belief in a primitive monotheism." Therein the author seems more ready to hearken to the hypothesis of these scientists than to receive the natural impression which the Bible would make upon him. The same influence has helped to determine Canon Gore's view of Inspiration. The early chapters of Genesis may be mythical; historical errors may be found in the sacred writers; even Christ himself may not be an authority on the authorship of Old Testament books. This view is probably more widely accepted in this country now than it was fifteen years ago. It is a conceivable one. But is it true? Is it Paul's, or Peter's? Or is it in harmony with the character and practice of Him of whom Mr. Moberly says "The Man Jesus was Himself the Eternal God," and who says with His own lips "I am the

truth." Surely no mere hypothesis, nothing short of absolute demonstration of such error on the part of inspired writers or of such accomodation on the part of Christ, should lead us to accept that view. He who is convinced that there is such error is bound to accept it or abandon everything. The former alternative is of course the wiser and as such the Canon commends it.

One other point just here. Canon Holland, in his desire to save the faith from anxiety due to changes in scientific or historical opinions, follows the line of thought started by Schleiermacher and widely accepted to-day and dwells too exclusively on the subjective side of things and unwisely underestimates objective evidence. Rom. I.:19 and X.:17 declare positively that in the works of nature and the words of Christ we have a knowledge that mothers faith. Mr. Illingworth more properly shows how a larger view of the world gives us "a crowning proof of purposeful design."

Honest High Churchmen could not write of the Christ and sacraments without running counter to Baptist views at almost every turn. It is amazing to see how even such bright and learned men get confused here. It is another proof of the influence of early training. Not one jot of High Church teaching is here abated. The Church is one, visible, and made up of those who submit themselves to Baptism. It takes the individual at his birth and incorporates him into its own life. "Baptism, with its gifts of grace, gives as some security that the man's real self is on the side of unselfishness." "The sacramental principle is the regular employment of visible means for the achievement of divine mysteries." The Episcopate is the guarantee of unity and of truth as well. Priestliness is the prime element of her being, but this does not militate against a special order of priests. "A national Church alone can consecrate the whole life of a people." All this in the face not only of their own repeated declarations of the intensely personal nature of religion but also of the history of Christianity.

This book can be especially commended to two classes of people. It will be helpful to those who are beset by difficulties raised by current thought touching the fundamental truths of revelation; and even the articles on

Church and Sacraments might suggest some helpful reflections for Christians who hold aloof from all Churches and ignore all ordinances, and for all who read with discrimination there is much that will prove suggestive, stimulating and strengthening.

J. H. Farmer.

Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus; Darstellung und religionsgeschichtliche Beleuchtung.

Von W. Heitmüller. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1903.

This brochure of 56 pages is an address delivered before an association of ministers at Hanover and again at Brunswick in the spring of 1903. The argument goes to prove that the sacramental view of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper is taught by Paul. With this remarkable thesis to maintain the author indulges in some remarkable reasoning, as might be expected; but he has produced a clever and vigorous presentation of his case. As is customary for a German, he takes his start by attacking the position of another, who had written on the question, Whether the Reformatory estimate of the Sacraments still exists? Or whether the present Lutheran church has not departed from the Reformation ideas of the Sacraments? The author prefers to state his problem thus: Whether the Biblical estimate of the Sacraments still prevails? This brings up the deeper question whether the Biblical view is still accepted as authority? Waiving this, however, he presents his attempt to find out what Paul teaches as to the efficacy and meaning of the two ordinances.

In regard to baptism Herr Heitmüller takes up first the great passage in Rom. 6:1-4. It is almost needless to say that the author has no thought of anything else than immersion as the act of baptism, and his exegesis proceeds on that accepted basis. He also rules out infant-baptism, as having no place in the New Testament teaching. His problem is to discover what efficacy Paul attached in his writings to the baptism of believers. He holds that in the passage cited, and others, Paul teaches ("baptized *into* Christ") that baptism either signifies or actually effects incorporation into Christ. He takes his stand for the latter view and plainly says (SS. 14, 15): "Baptism was

for Paul sacramental action, an action which works not *ex opere operantis* but *ex opere operato*, in the proper Catholic sense." This interpretation the author endeavors to justify by insisting on the literal sense of being actually made one with Christ, in the external act of baptism. This is to be distinguished from both faith and the moral and spiritual life which accompany or follow the act. The act of becoming one with Christ is in the act of baptism. Also the receiving of the Spirit is in the act of baptism, for in 1 Cor. 12:13, Paul says: "For through one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, etc." And the point of connection is found in 2 Cor. 3:17, where the Apostle says: "The Lord is the Spirit." In other passages also the Apostle indicates the actual working of union with Christ and coming into spiritual life as effected in baptism, as 1 Cor. 6:11; Col. 1:13, where our author remarks that by deliverance from the power of darkness Paul cannot mean anything but baptism. And there is more of this sort of assuming the point at issue. In fine, the author's whole contention is that not a symbolic and figurative but actual and operative union with Christ is effected by the act of baptism. It is the common High Church assertion that the literal, material sense of the phrases involved must be held at all hazards. By way of refutation of the symbolic, figurative sense of the passage our author adduces (S. 15f) the following reasons: (a) That the question whether the act of baptism is symbol only or spiritually efficacious is essentially modern and is not historically defensible. (b) That any one who is not influenced by this modern distinction would naturally take the language as literal. (c) That the passage in 1 Cor. 15:29, about being baptized for the dead, settles the whole question, for that undoubtedly means that those who were baptized for the dead acted with a view of bringing the sacramental value of baptism to bear on their departed friends. Our author fails to perceive his begging of the question here, and quietly goes on to put as a final argument (d) that the general position of Paul on faith and grace is not hostile to his contention but rather favors the sacramentarian view. We need not follow the author in these windings.

When he takes up the Lord's Supper our author admits

that the case is not so clear for his view as for baptism; but nothing daunted he pursues his endeavor to make Paul teach High Church doctrine here also. The discussion is confined to the 10th and 11th chapters of I. Corinthians. He admits that in the 10th chapter the Apostle speaks only incidentally of the Supper, and designedly in the 11th. The author reasons that the language of the 11th chapter is conditioned by the practical aim Paul had in view and therefore we are more likely to find his actual sentiments in the 10th chapter where he speaks without embarrassment! With this very convenient working principle he proceeds to interpret sacramentarianism into the 10th chapter by assuming that the "spiritual food" and "spiritual drink" spoken of as given to the Israelites mean for Paul the elements of the Supper, and since the first were supernatural so also must be the latter. Further, the reason of contrast applies, namely, in the statement that in partaking of the "table" and "cup" of demons one becomes of the same sort with them; for in partaking of the bread and wine in the Supper one also becomes one with Christ. When our author takes up the 11th chapter he admits that there is apparent discrepancy between these sacramentarian conceptions which he finds in the 10th and the clearly memorial character of the ordinance which every one must see in the long treatment of the matter in the 11th chapter. But a man who has a thesis to maintain is never at a loss for expedients to get around difficulties, and he accounts for the supposed change of tone by saying that in the 11th chapter Paul is treating the matter in a "theologizing" way—whatever that may mean!

Putting together the points of his discussion our author reaches the foregone conclusion that Paul actually does teach that the two ordinances have spiritual efficacy, and not only signify but really effect by their own working in the recipient, in the one case union with Christ, and in the other the nourishing of the life in Christ.

In the second part of his treatise the author seeks to show that these sacramentarian conceptions are part and parcel of various heathen religions, that they therefore belong to the general religious consciousness of man, were assumed and purified by Christianity (especially in

the Supper), and were so inwrought in the common feelings of men that they must have influenced Paul—though of course there is no direct trace of such influence! How ingenious all this and how inconclusive!

E. C. Dargan.

The Teaching of Jesus Concerning The Scriptures.
By David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D. American Tract Society. New York. 75c.

This is the fourth volume of a new series on "The Teaching of Jesus." The three preceding volumes are "His Own Mission," by Frank Hugh Foster, "The Kingdom of God and the Church," by Gerhardus Vos, and "God the Father," by Archibald Thomas Robertson.

Dr. Burrell, the author, is the efficient pastor of the Collegiate Reformed Church, New York City, and the author of several other excellent books, especially of expository sermons. The vigor, directness and practical force which characterize his preaching are conspicuous in his books. He thinks for himself and has a most unhesitating and ringing way of putting things.

"The question," he says, is to Christians, "one of supreme interest." "As to others, they are at liberty to believe what they like; but those who call themselves disciples of Jesus have no alternative but to renounce him or to accept what he says." This is "the Court of last resort" for them.

When he comes to deal with the perversion of the words of Jesus by some of the critics he doesn't mince matters. He doesn't hesitate to say that a method so distinctly literary as that of the "higher criticism" "lay outside the province of Jesus' work;" but he adds that the radical form of the "higher criticism," as represented by those who insist that no true estimate can be formed of the Scriptures by students of this problem except by first dispossessing themselves of all conviction as to this divine origin and character, had no place in the precept or example of Jesus. "Could he regard the Bible as mere 'literature'? Not for a moment! He believed in it as the one Book, standing solitary and alone, separated from all other literature whatsoever by the fact that God breathed

it." Dispossess himself of all such views in order to pass an "unbiased" judgment upon it! "As well ask a loving and loyal son to give up his natural regard for his mother in order to qualify himself for service on a jury which has been impanelled to investigate her personal purity." "It is unthinkable."

"This is the question: Does the Bible bear unequivocal testimony to the claims of Jesus as the Incarnate Word, and does Jesus bear witness, correspondingly, to the claim of the Scriptures as the written Word of God? If so, in the two together, constituting the biomial Word, we may confidently rest as in a full, true and final revelation of God."

To the latter half of the question, with which the author has to do, he gives a varied, vigorous and, in the main, convincing answer. To the question, "Do Christ and the Bible stand or fall together?" he answers unhesitatingly, "No." "There is, in fact," he says, "no question as to Christ's or the Bible's standing or falling, apart or together. Neither can fall under any circumstances. They stand. They stand together as the mutual complementary, reflexively corroborative and equally trustworthy Incarnate and Written Words of God. And they stand forever, 'for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.' "

"The crowing testimony of the Bible to its own divineness," the author admits, however, "is its proved power unto salvation." But he expands this thought as follows: "All through the Book, from Eden to the Apocalyptic vision, walks the majestic figure on one who claims to be the deliverer of the soul. In the midst of these oracles stands the Cross, throwing its shadow four ways towards all the horizons of human life. Out of this blessed volume comes the voice, always and everywhere, 'He that believeth in the Lord Jesus Christ shall be saved.' "

He pays his respects to the "Polychrome Bible" and to the "Destructive Critics" in many a salty passage. In the body of the book and in the "appendix" he attacks "The Kenosis Theory," by which some, while professing to be Christians, would break the force of the testimony of Christ to the Scriptures. He denies "absolutely" that

there are any statements in Scriptures that are "mutually contradictory," "except in the case of literal or numerical discrepancies of little or no importance, and due wholly to transcription." He not only marshals the the positive testimony of Jesus to the Scripture, but interprets his negative testimony, "in the eloquent silence which he observed with reference to all those alleged errors which are so magnified and emphasized by the destructive critics of our time." In conclusion, he exclaims, "Blessed Bible! Old-fashioned but not obsolete! Our rod and staff to lean upon until we come to heaven's gate!"

It will be seen from this brief survey and these quotations what the author's attitude to the problems he faces is, and how he treats them. He has the virtues and the faults of the preacher. His book will gain, however, rather than lose, by this—in popular power. Viewed in the light of its purpose, it is an important contribution to a living subject. GEORGE B. EAGER.

The Attractive Church.

Rev. Cortland Myers, D.D. American Baptist Publication Society. Philadelphia.

The author of this booklet, "Minister at the Baptist Temple, Brooklyn," believes that "the attractive church" is the divine ideal, and that every legitimate means should be adopted to make the church the most attractive place in the world. That church is truly a failure which fails to be a force by which men are drawn to him who said, "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." "We need students of church organization and method and spirit," he says, "as much as we need students of theology." Accordingly, through a half a dozen chapters, he deals with various aspects of the subject, "the Attractive Building," "the Attractive Sermon," "the Attractive Music," "the Attractive Organization," "the Attractive Atmosphere," and "the Attractive Conviction."

The spirit and point of view of the author are indicated in such sentences as these: "This has been a destructive era; everything has been thrown into the crucible for analysis; it has almost assumed the spirit of a morbid passion." "But a new day is dawning—a creative era,

a time of construction instead of destruction, of bringing the parts together and charging them with life instead of cutting them to pieces and rejoicing in their death." "Men have become wearied of this cold and heartless analysis and criticism in every part of the world, and especially in the religious part. With hunger unappeased they are now turning to the tables of everlasting truth and life. Interest in this intellectual surgery is growing less and the cry of the universal soul is heard everywhere. 'Life! Life! The life of God!' The life of God in the soul of man—that is religion."

Touching the indifference of workingmen, careless about the church, he says: "It is not true that the church has taken no interest in their social aspirations. It is the one institution of the world devoted to the service of the poor and the battle against the enemies of the hearts and homes of the working people." The cause of such indifference is fundamental and one in essence with all classes. It is not primarily in the church itself; it is in the man; he is breathing poisonous air,—he is materialistic in spirit almost to the point of brutality. He is sensual and indulgent, he loves idleness and revels in the low and dissolute." R. J. Campbell, of London, could make no more serious charges; but Myers, perhaps, is more discriminating than Campbell was in the charges that lately made such a sensation among English workingmen. He doesn't believe the church can consistently "make organizations to compete with the world." It "ought to feed the hungry, but first, last, and always, it ought to bring to them the bread of life." "Not to compete, but to surpass in the sublimity of its purpose, is the attraction." "Principle and purpose may be both fixed and universal, but the method is flexible." "Whatever else this age may demand, it is persistent in its emphasis on the practical. What do you want to do, and what will do it? is the modern question standing over against every enterprise. Simplicity, no less than vitality and efficiency, is demanded. "Discover what ought to be done, and make a machine to do it; make it for this time and place and purpose, and, if need be, regardless of everything which the mind of man, even inspired of heaven, has ever thought out before!"

A new spirit is making its way through the world—the spirit of brotherhood, helpfulness, mutualism. Competition and "rights" must give way to co-operation and duty. This is a crucial hour in the history of the church, and this is the test: will we catch the new spirit, will we echo the divine word which fell warm from the lips of Christ? "Brotherhood is possible only in Christ."

The world does not need a new gospel, nor even a modified gospel. There may be a "new evangelism," but there is only one evangel. The power of God unto salvation is ever the same, a very Niagara; but there are modern dynamos, and their right use will make this stream of the ages move and light the world.

The author comes with a timely message and delivers it for the most part with kindling directness and force.

GEO. B. EAGER.

Seeing Darkly.

J. Sparhawk Jones, D.D. The Staff Method, S. S. Mitchell, D.D. Presbyterian Board of Publication. Philadelphia. 1904. Each 75c. net.

We have here numbers IX. and X. of the series of small volumes of sermons by representative Presbyterians of the day. Some of the earlier volumes have been noticed in previous issues of this Review. The books are all uniform in style and general purpose. The first sermon in each volume gives title to the book.

A masculine thinker is Dr. J. Sparhawk Jones. There is strength of grip, balance of judgment, thoroughness of probing, corresponding vigor of expression in these discussions. A little careless of homiletical symmetry, of occasional needless repetition, of a slight redundancy of vigor here and there, the preacher gives us something to think about in his striking handling of his matter. The moral quality of the discourses is Scriptural and high, and constitutes the main body of thought, the evangelical element being somewhat in abeyance. In the first sermon on Seeing Darkly the preacher forcibly brings out the important truth that though as yet we see obscurely, still we do see. Both the limitations and the value of imperfect knowledge of divine things are strongly presented. In the sermon on Rahab the divine employment of faulty

agencies is strikingly set out, and the worth of even a crude faith in the better things is emphasized. In the discourse on the Unprofitable Servant we have a vigorous criticism of our tendency to praise in ourselves and each other the simple performance of evident duty, while yet the value of such performance is not slighted. A striking sermon on Paul Aboard shows how the presence of one man of worth may be the saving of a multitude, and the vexed question of the co-operation of the divine purpose with our common sense and activity is duly presented. Altogether the set of sermons is a vigorous, fresh and able presentation of some of the deeper aspects of divine truth and human duty. The sermons are all worth reading.

In Dr. Mitchell's volume the title sermon on the Staff Method is a thoughtful and sharp attack on the proxy method of doing Christian work, based on Elisha's sending Gehazi with his staff instead of going himself to heal the Shunammite's child. A plea for personal ministry in our religious activities is earnestly, and none too earnestly, made. A suggestive sermon on the Divine-Human Face—"the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ"—takes up several incidents in our Lord's life and imagines how he looked on the persons mentioned: Matthew the publican, the little children whom he blessed, the hypocritical Pharisees, the woman taken in adultery, those who crucified him, and the penitent robber. This is interesting but at times a little forced and fanciful. In the sermon on the Skepticism of Prominent People the preacher says a wise word on the matter of making too huch of this, and shows how men strong in one department of thought are not thereby authorities in others, how skepticism is often a fruit of moral or spiritual corruption. Other sermons deal with various questions of the day, and the treatment is rather moral and apologetic than evangelical and devotional. The style is not easy and flowing, a trifle affected in places, lacking in suppleness and vigor. The thought, never profound, is sensible and just. Illustration is freely and effectively used.

E. C. Dargan.

Man and His Environment; Thoughts of a Thinker.

Collected and edited by his friend, John P. Kingsland, author of "The Man Called Jesus." Pp. 334. New York, James Pott & Co.

The identity of the "Thinker" of these thoughts is carefully concealed. Their general character is sufficiently indicated by the dedication and the table of contents. "To all seekers after truth, groping thro' darkness and twilight up to the Eternal Light, I dedicate this book, the record of the spiritual experiences of that friend of mine who sought and found."

After the introduction, explaining the relation of the compiler to the author, there are eight chapters, dealing with Truth, Mankind, Life, Forces, Religion (three chapters), Love.

In this age of scientific scepticism and individual questioning of all truth, there is a large number of men who pursue a path of departure from all truths based on revelation and involving the supernatural, out into the deserts of doubt and uncertainty; and who then by processes of their own reasoning return to many of the teachings from which they had departed. They then persuade themselves that these truths belong to man scientifically and may be arrived at by man's native spiritual powers. They seem to forget, or to ignore, the question, whether man would ever have reached these high truths in his own powers. They have only sought a different basis for the high facts of revelation. They thereby show that the recognition of, and surrender to, God is our "rational service." But they suffer a distinct loss in leaving the direct message of God to men out of the count and leaving themselves with no standard of spiritual truth. Moreover they that travel this road never come again into the full possession of God's thought for men. They generally gain vitality for their spiritual life but at the expense of its comprehensiveness.

Our author represents one of the very highest types of this class of thinkers. He gives nothing really new. But the record of an intense religious experience is both interesting and helpful. He gives us a remarkably clear and vigorous discussion of "the three orders" of human experience, namely the sense order, the mind order, and the spirit order. Man must live *in* all these orders; he

can live *for* only one of them and this determines the character of the man and his destiny. In connection with the spiritual order we find a highly suggestive chapter on conversion. It does not reach an explanation of this experience and it reveals the author's failure to recognize the personal presence and agency of the Holy Spirit. Yet it presents some highly suggestive features of conversion.

The author may be said to represent the highest type of the Unitarian, which is as far as any man could arrive without entering again the sphere of revealed truth. He does not deny the divinity of Jesus but only finds the light of His personality too dazzling for human investigation. He presents the hope of ultimate redemption for every soul in its strongest possible light, and all the more so that he recognizes so fully that God can never be less than just. It was to be expected that the interpretation of the divine character would be in a one-sided emphasis on love.

The compiler tells us that there remains still "a huge pile" of his friend's notes which the world may hope to see if they show due appreciation of this installment.

W. O. Carver.

Quiet Talks on Prayer.

By S. D. Gordon. The Fleming H. Revell Co. New York. 234 pp. 75c. net.

The spirit of these "talks" is beyond criticism. The author is a man with a message to this generation, as was abundantly shown by his first volume, "Quiet Talks on Power," which has won so large a place for itself in Europe as well as in America. The book is characterized by the same devoutness, saneness and simplicity of style that gave the other such cordial recognition, and will, we are sure, render a like genuine service to Christian living.

The thinking is as clear as it is spiritual, and withal thoroughly practical. For instance the conception of what prayer is, aims at, and effects is discriminating and helpful. To the very old question: "Does prayer influence God?" he answers "No" and "Yes." Not "No" only, as skeptical scientists answer; not "Yes" only, as the scholarly Christians answer; but "No" and "Yes." "It

does not influence his purpose; it does influence his action." "What God knows we need he has already planned to give." "Jesus says: 'Your Father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask.' 'The question for me then is this: Do I know what He knows I need? Let me learn, and ask for that; or let me say, Dear God, you choose. I choose what you choose.'" In short: prayer is a spiritual force acting on a spiritual environment, and producing a reaction proportionate to the force. It aims to get God's will done on earth. Its effect is not to change God's purpose, but to influence God's action, and that is just what the labor of the farmer does in the field. The greatest prayer, then, that can be offered is the Spirit-breathed prayer which Jesus himself prayed: "Thy will be done."

In method and detail, however, the author is not always as satisfactory. That the issue to-day between science and faith practically turns on the efficacy of prayer, is beyond question, as Mr. Gordon clearly perceives. But we are at a loss to know just what he means by saying, "Nature's laws are merely God's habit of action in handling secondary forces. They involve no purpose of God. His purposes are regarding moral issues." Then, at times, his exposition of Biblical teaching is marred by uncritical assumptions, as, for example, that "Revelation" is "the latest of the Biblical books," and by a rather excessive literalism and anthropomorphism. He seems to intimate that prayer is not in the name of Jesus unless Jesus' name is mentioned in the prayer; and he tells us, as if with authority, that the dominion of the world was transferred by Adam to Satan, and now is Satan's! Apart, however, from such blemishes, he has given us a most timely, spiritual and helpful book. One is reminded in reading it of Sir Oliver Lodge's remarkable eirenicon between the men of faith and the men of science (*Ideals of Science and Faith*), and is astonished to think what a change there has been among representative scientists concerning the reasonableness of prayer, since Professor Tyndall's day, when many thought with him that he had reduced prayer to an absurdity by his transiently famous proposition of a prayer-test.

Geo. B. Eager.

Religious Liberty. An Historical Paper.

By Henry Melville King. 132 pages. Preston & Rounds Co. Providence, R. I. 1903.

This comprehensive "historical paper" on what is just now a subject of world-wide interest, represents some of the author's best work. The booklet is a growth. The facts it presents in this form were first used in addresses and in papers read before historical societies, then published in pamphlet form before they took the present shape. Evidently the material has been well worked over and worked up, revised and made more complete.

The author does not seem to have had access to original sources, for the most part at least, but, clearly, he has made good use of the literature of the subject. He shows acquaintance with the leading authorities at home and abroad. He quotes among others: Ludwig Keller, of Berlin, once state archivist at Münster, "a most thorough and impartial student of the Anabaptist movement" ("Preussische Jahrbücher," Sept. 1882); and Cornelius the able Roman Catholic historian of the uprising at Münster ("Geschichte des Münsterschen Aufrouhrs), and Emil Egli, the Swiss historian, who detected that the "principles from which the Anabaptists proceeded manifest a powerful grasp of original Christian ideas." ("Die Züricher Wiedertaüfer zur Reformationszeit."); as well as Professor Masson, author of "The Life of Milton;" A. Innes' intersting monogram on "Church and State;" Professor Williston Walker's "Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism;" Griffis' "Dudleian Lecture at Harvard University," 1892; Sanford H. Cobb's "Rise of Religious Liberty in America;" Oscar S. Straus' "Roger Williams, the Pioneer of Religious Liberty;" Curry's "Struggles and Triumphs of Virginia Baptists;" James' "Documentary History of the Struggle for Religious Liberty in Virginia;" Thom's "Struggle for Religious Freedom in Virginia;" Rider's "Soul Liberty, Rhode Island's Gift to the Nation,' and Leonard Woolsey Bacon's "History of American Christianity.' In short, he gives first and last, in his pages and footnotes, quite a bibliography of the subject. The book ought to prove interesting, not to Baptists only, whose forefathers have played so large and tragic a part in the struggles it re-

cords, but also to a growing number of candid scholars of all faiths; indeed, to all lovers of freedom of thought and worship everywhere in the old world and the new, who are searching for the truth and teaching of history on this important, but, heretofore, neglected, subject.

It is a pity that the book had to be marred in places for the lack of a careful proof-reader. For example in the index, Cotton Mather appears as "Matthew, Cotton," though in the text the name is correct, and Thom's "Struggle for Religious Freedom," etc., is set down as "Thorn's," though, that, too, is right in the text. Then on p. 111 Dr. James' book appears in a footnote as "Documentary History of the Struggle for Religious *History* in Virginia." But these are small matters.

Dr. King has certainly made a valuable contribution to the popular historical literature of a great subject.

GEO. B. EAGER.

Politische Ethik und Christenthum.

Von Ernest Troeltsch, Doktor u. o. Professor der Theologie in Heidelberg. Göttengin. 1904.

This brochure is an address delivered before the fifteenth Evangelical-social Congress held in Breslau last spring. The author confines himself to the consideration of the ethics of European politics, leaving America entirely out of the count. He declares that the conception of the state and of society stands to-day under the sign of realism. The two causes which have led to this state of affairs are the influence of Bismarck and the prevailing materialistic theory of history which makes economic considerations precede and control everything else. Of Bismarck he says, p. 6: "Beyond him very few Germans have learned to think politically. The kernel of his political theory was that the essence of the state is power, that its sure foundation is a well equipped army, that it can meet the constantly threatening dangers without and within only by a careful but vigorous use of power, and that for these ends nothing is more hurtful than principles and theory. To these principles, it must be openly confessed, belonged ethics. . . . In his program there were no principles; at one time he called to his help and used ethical principles and powers and again cast them aside

and made sport of them." The author believes that this political theory has been useful to Germany, but that it now needs modification.

He divides the present day theories of ethics as applied to politics into four groups, viz., the ethics of the state which merely serves the interests of a free culture, the purely nationalistic ethics when the state is exalted into a *summum bonum* the ethics of a Democracy and the ethics of Conservatism. He does not find in any of these groups essentially Christian ideas. This is because "there is no political ethics derived immediately and essentially from Christian ideas. And in fact there never has been such an ethics," p. 22. But Christianity contains two apparently opposing principles which must eventually enter and deeply affect political ethics. They are the conception of the absolute value of personality which is developed in Christianity as nowhere else, and the thought of submission to God's order in the universe. The first principle alone would lead to revolutions and wild extravagances, it is democratic; the second would lead to servile submission to whatever is, it is conservative. The two ideas fully developed and fully realized is the state to be desired. They seem to be opposing principles and have never yet been united, but in the author's opinion they can be and will be united. "Christianity is democratic and conservative at the same time." p. 37.

The booklet is an interesting study of the subject in hand, but is not intended for political conditions prevailing in America.

W. J. McGlothlin.

Heinrich Ewald, Orientalist and Theologian.

1803–1903. A Centenary Appreciation by T. Witton Davies, Ph. D. Published by T. Fisher Unwin, London. 1903.

This small volume grew out of an address which the author delivered on the 1st of October, 1902, before the North Wales University College. It is made attractive not only by the author's sincere admiration for the great German scholar Ewald and the rich fund of personal anecdotes in which Ewald is the central figure, but also

by a careful scholarly estimate of the great teacher's strength and weakness, virtues and faults. Excellent portraits of Ewald and his rivals in the world of oriental scholarship, together with several of his most famous pupils, lend an added charm to the volume.

The author's opening characterization of Ewald, while generous, is also just: "Entering upon life at the opening of the century that has recently closed, he was, without doubt, the greatest Old Testament scholar of the century, and he produced books at once more numerous, more original, and more valuable than did any other writer in the same field during that century. Such a combination of rare scholarship in many departments, of singular courage and independence, of almost unexampled productiveness as author, and of teaching power scarcely inferior, is hardly to be found in any other single man; certainly it has been very rarely, if ever, surpassed."

At twenty-three Ewald was the author of a Hebrew Grammar, a book which passed through many editions and had an epoch-making influence in the study of Hebrew Syntax. Ewald had a capacity for work that was truly remarkable. He rose before five o'clock in the morning and worked in his study or at the university almost every moment of the day except when he was at his meals or on his daily constitutional through the streets of the town.

Dr. Davies gives much attention to Ewald's controversies both political and scholarly. Incidentally we get glimpses of many of the foremost scholars in Germany and Great Britain. A full bibliography greatly enhances for the student the value of this interesting little book.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

A Short Introduction to the Gospels.

By Ernest DeWitt Burton, Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the University of Chicago. University of Chicago Press. Chicago. 1904. Pages 144. Price $1.00.

This is a brief treatise designed for students who have just entered upon the study of the Gospels. There are five chapters, four of which were originally written for the Biblical World and afterwards published in pamphlet form. There is much helpful information in the volume. As to the Gospel of John, Prof. Burton holds that "an

apostle, presumably John, was not only the source, but in a sense the writer, of this book. Yet the book perhaps does not owe its present form to him." He says further: "This material left the hand of the author, moreover, not in the form of the book which we have, but in a number of smaller books." Again he says: "They indicate that the book is mainly from one hand, but they imply also that we may expect to find four strata of material, or rather evidences of four influences at work," of which the fourth is "possibly the blundering work of a copyist or binder." It will thus be seen that Prof. Burton does not think that the Apostle John is the author of the Gospel as we now have it, "but a series of historical sermons" were preached by him which have been added to by a later hand and put together wrong. This is a modification of the views of Wendt and Bacon, and largely destroys the value of the Gospel as orderly and objective history. "In its spirit," he says, "the book is far more the work of a preacher seeking to develop spiritual life, than of an historian seeking to produce an accurate record of past events." We are glad to note that Prof. James Drummond, the Unitarian scholar, of Oxford, in his recent great work on the "Authorship of the Fourth Gospel," accepts the genuineness and integrity of the Gospel of John, though he is not able to take as an historic event the account of the resurrection of Lazarus. The chief stumbling block that many modern scholars find in the Gospel of John is its unequivocal claim and proof of the essential deity of Jesus. But the integrity of the book remains and will remain. A. T. Robertson

Studies in the Gospel According to Mark. For the use of Classes in Secondary Schools and in the Secondary Division of the Sunday School.

By Ernest DeWitt Burton, Professor in the University of Chicago The University of Chicago Press. $1.50.

This volume of the *Constructive Bible Studies* series is most worthy whether considered in its mechanical execution, and the quality of the material, in its conformity with pedagogical principles, in its extensive illustrations and maps, or in its fitness for inducting the youth into Mark's view of the Christ.

There is a careful analysis with division into sections with suggestive topics; explanatory notes with each section and questions of three classes, "questions of attention, questions of investigation, questions of reflection and application." A brief, carefully prepared "dictionary" was an essential for such study as the volume contemplates. The dealing with certain words in the dictionary, like some few of the notes on the text, is unsatisfactory in that the doctrine of the deity of Jesus is avoided and the way left open for its denial. No teaching directly antagonistic to this doctrine has been noticed. The personality of the Devil and the reality of demoniacal possession also have some doubt cast on them. Perhaps so much Prof. Burton felt bound in conscience to do in deference of scientific doubt and his own convictions. As a rule, however, Mark is allowed fully to tell his own story and the student is in every way helped to reach the deep teaching and implications of the Gospel.

That there is some demand for such careful studies of Scripture is manifest to any observer. That this demand can be greatly increased should also be obvious. That this is desirable in the highest degree should need no proof.

Teachers and classes that wish really to study this Gospel will find more helpful direction here than in many volumes of the more ponderous sort.

W. O. Carver.

A History of Education in the United States.

By Edwin Grant Dexter. The Macmillan Co. 1904.

In this volume of 650 pages the author has given us an admirable sketch of our educational history in all its aspects. The work is divided into three parts. In the first part the author traces the rise of the "People's Schools" in the various sections of the country, the developments in elementary education, the developments in public secondary education, the developments in school organization and administration and closes with an interesting history of text-books.

The second part treats of higher and special education; the rise and history of the most important colleges and universities, the history of theological education, legal

education, education in medicine and allied subjects; technical and agricultural education, normal training; art, manual and commercial education; education of women, education of negroes, Indians and defectives, as the blind, etc.

In part third the author treats of the various means of extending education, such as libraries, newspapers and periodicals, summer, evening and correspondence schools, learned societies, lectures, museums, etc. In conclusion there is an appendix which contains several interesting original documents bearing on the history of education.

It was of course impossible for the author to give more than a general survey of the various departments of the vast subject treated. He has, however, provided each chapter with a carefully prepared bibliography which doubles the value of the book. It is provided with full index, marginal references, tables, etc., that make its use exceedingly easy and satisfactory. We have greatly needed such a birdseye view of our educational history as this. Our progress has been very gratifying and this account of that progress should have a wide sale.

W. J. McGlothlin.

Questions of Faith. A Series of Lectures on the Creed.

New York. A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1904. Pages 212. Price $1.50.

Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, the brilliant author of The Fact of Christ, is pastor of the Renfield Church, Glasgow. Last winter he had a series of Sunday evening discourses on the Apostles' Creed, as it is called. Prof. James Orr, took as his subject What Is God? Prof. H. R. Mackintosh announced this question, Is Christ the Son of God? Prof. Marcus Dods had this query, Did Christ Rise from the Dead? Prof. Laidlaw asked the question, What Do We Mean by the Holy Spirit? Prof. Thomas M. Lindsay had as his problem, What Is the Catholic Church? Prof. James Denney asked, Can Sins be Forgiven? Finally, Mr. Simpson himself closed the series with the solemn question, Is There Life After Death? It is needless to say that it is a very able set of addresses. These Scotch theological professors have a strong grip on vital truth.

The United Free Church has come to be proud of them. The least satisfactory address is the one on The Catholic Church, by Prof. Lindsay, for he attempts to set forth the general visible church idea as scriptural. The general church is taught in the New Testament as a present reality, but not as a visible organization. Some of these addresses are very helpful, indeed. Perhaps the last one by Mr. Simpson has as much merit as any of them. It is withal a most stimulating volume. A. T. Robertson.

Sabbath-School Teacher-Training Course. First Year.

A Series of Thirty-nine Lessons, designed for use in Normal Classes. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. 1904.

Seven sensible specialists have united to make an admirable manual for Bible school teachers. There are six lessons on the Bible by Prof. Amos R. Wells, seven lessons on Bible History by President George B. Stewart, five on the Lands of the Bible by Rev. Charles A. Oliver, four on Bible Worship by Dr. Robert J. Miller, four on the Sabbath-school by Dr. H. L. Phillips, seven on the Teacher by Dr. A. H. McKinney, and six lessons on the Pupil by Prof. Walter C. Murray, D.D., The work is all of high grade and thoroughly practical. If our Presbyterian brethren can induce their Bible school teachers to master these lessons, their Sabbath-schools will at once attain increased efficiency. We have noticed a few slips in proof reading, such as the statement on page 65 that the boards of the Tabernacle were eighty-five feet long; but in general the little book is a model of accuracy and quite comprehensive and interesting.

The lessons on the Teacher by Dr. McKinney, who recently lectured before the faculty and students of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary on Teacher Training, are of unusual interest and value.

John R. Sampey.

Leaves for Quiet Hours.

George Matheson, D.D. A. C. Armstrong & Son. New York. 1904. $1.25.

This collection of short devotional meditations from the pen and heart of Dr. Matheson will be welcomed by those

who have derived devout pleasure and profit from his *Times of Retirement*, while they who will make the acquaintance of the author in this treatise have before them a rich repast of spiritual food. As the author well says in the preface: "A devotional book is believed to be a very simple thing. It ought to be the most difficult composition in the world, for it would aim at the marriage of qualities which are commonly supposed to be antagonistic—the insight of the thinker and the fervor of the worshipper." Nothing could better describe the book itself than the last phrase. At times Dr. Matheson vindicates the mystic's privilege, and poetically rather than grammatically interprets his Bible, lets fancy and devotion rather than sound exegesis tell him what Scripture means. But the attitude of reverence for the Bible is happily combined with that of large outlook on all truth. The thinking is full of insight and upreach, and the devotion is pure, tender, elevated. Food for the mind, light for the soul is this sweet and helpful book.

E. C. Dargan.

Die Messianische-Apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judenthums.

By W. Baldensperger, Professor in University of Giessen. J. H. Ed. Heitz. Strassburg, Germany. 1903.

This is the "dritte voellig umbgearbeitete Auflage" of a very valuable work already well known. It is the "erste Haelfte" of Das Selbstbewusstsin Jesu, a standard book on a very important subject. Prof. Baldensperger, of the University of Giessen, is a bold thinker and a thorough scholar. He is at home in the Jewish Apocalyptic literature and gives a vivid picture of the Messianic hopes cherished by the Jews of that time. This is the background for the Messianic consciousness of Jesus himself and makes plain why the Pharisees rejected him as Messiah. One cannot accept all of Baldensperger's theories, but they are always worthy of consideration. The book recalls Bousset's recent volume, viz., Die Judische Apokalyptik (1903), and Die Religion des Judenthums im Neutestamentlichen Zeitaller (1903).

A. T. Robertson.

Die Lehre Jesu.

Von Hans Hinrich Wendt. Zweite, verbesserte Auflage. Goettingern, Germany. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1901. S. 641, Pr. 12 m.

This great work needs no introduction to any well-informed minister. We have it already in an excellent English translation, and it is the most thorough discussion of the subject from the critical standpoint that we have as yet. But many who even have the English translation would find it advantageous to possess also this second and improved edition of the German original. It is printed in one volume instead of two, and the criticism of the sources is shortened, while the new books on the subject up to 1901 are discussed. The bound edition is 13 marks and 85 pfennigs. Dr. Wendt does not accept all of the Gospel of John as authentic, and his criticism is free enough for anybody. But he has a strong grasp of the material as a whole and the inner development of ideas is brought out with a master hand. There is originality of perception, and certainly one does not have to accept all the brilliant Jena professor's ideas unless he is satisfied of their truthfulness.

A. T. Robertson.

What A Young Man Ought to Know.

By Sylvanus Stall, D.D. The Vir Publishing Company, Philadelphia. 1904. Price, $1.00, net.

The Personal Purity series of eight volumes edited by Dr. Stall has been warmly commended by wise and good men and women in all the walks of life. Information that ought to be in possession of boys and girls, men and women, is here imparted by those who seek to fortify the innocent against temptation and reclaim the erring. The statements of this book for young men rest on a solid basis of fact, and the author seeks to win young men to lead perfectly pure lives. He is not visionary, nor does he seek financial profit by appealing to morbid curiosity. How much better that knowledge of nature's mysteries should be communicated by a chaste writer than by wicked companions or covetous quacks!

Pastors, teachers and parents ought to read these books and pass them on to those for whom they have been prepared.

John R. Sampey.

Die Sittlichen Weisungen Jesu. Ihr Missbrauch und ihr richtiger Gebrauch.

Von W. Herrmann, Professor an der Universitat Marburg. Goettingen, Germany. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1904. S. 65. Pr. 1m.

The ethical teachings of Jesus are now receiving more treatment than ever before. It is time, for the writers on modern scientific ethics have largely ignored what Jesus has said as visionary and impracticable. But in so doing they have themselves failed to build upon the rock. The author in this brief treatise sets forth in sharp outline the positions of Luther and Tolstoi. He says: "It is one of the joyful signs of our time that Tolstoi's moral greatness makes so many quake." Again: "The best in the Russian Church is the piety in opposition to traditionalism. Tolstoi is in that respect its genuine son." There is terseness and strength in this brochure, and the discussion as a whole is stimulating. I think he is clearly mistaken, however, in so narrowing the horizon of Jesus as to say of him that in his view the company of disciples had no future (Keine Zukunft, sondern ein nahes Ende). That is to attribute a pessimism and a shortness of vision to Christ wholly unwarranted.

A. T. Robertson

Growing Toward God.

By Rev. G. B. F. Hallock, D.D. American Tract Society. New York. $1.00.

A series of devotional studies after the manner of Dr. J. R. Miller's well known writings. Some of the subjects are: Growing Toward God (which gives the title), Turning Aside to See, Take Time to be Holy, Celestial Citizenship, Our Temptations and Their Conquest, Little Sins, Spiritual Lonesomeness, Safeguards Against Sin, and a number of similar ones. The short essays probably served as sermons or prayer meeting talks before being written, and this gives a certain element of practical power to them. The thought is not profound, but sweet and wholesome; the style is simple and clear; the spirit devout and hopeful; the illustrations are abundant, natural and effective. Altogether it is a judicious and helpful devotional treatise.

E. C. Dargan.

A Short History of England.

By Edward P. Cheyney, Professor of European History in the University of Pennsylvania. Ginn & Co. Boston. 1904. Pages 695.

Professor Cheyney had already written an "Industrial and Social History of England." It would be hard to find in one volume so much that is valuable and interesting about England as one can get in this new work of Cheyney. The maps are new and numerous. The pictures are many and luminous. The analysis is clear and able. The matter which, condensed is yet presented in a flowing style. It is a fascinating book and a joy to read. The colonies are treated, so that the whole great British Empire passes in review before the reader. If you wish a one-volume history of England that is brought down to the present year and is adequate and interesting this is the book. A. T. Robertson.

Bethink Yourselves.

By Leo. Tolstoi. Ginn & Co., Boston. Pp. 50.

This is an attack after Tolstoi's vigorous manner upon war. Satire, indignation, invective enter into the hot blasts of the author's arraignment of modern warfare. The occasion of his writing is the present war between Russia and Japan. Much of what the author says is of the nature of comments upon events which have occurred since the war began. The Czar, the generals and admirals and government generally are blamed for war. The people are their victims and their dupes. Jesus began the teachings which will in the end destroy war. Those teachings are beginning to influence the world and will triumph at last. E. Y. Mullins.

Dux Christus. An Outline Study of Japan.

By William Elliot Griffis. New York. The Macmillan Co. 300 pp. Paper. Price 30c.

This little volume is the fourth issued in the United Study of Missions series. Dr. Griffis is thoroughly qualified for this task having taken active part in Japan's evolution. He has done his work well. He gives good outline accounts of the empire, the modern development, the religions, the missions, and the present outlook.

W. O. Carver.

The Plays of Shakespeare.

Edited by William J. Rolfe, Litt. D. The American Book Company. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. Romeo and Juliet, As You Like It. Midsummer Night's Dream, King Richard the Third, King Henry the Fifth, Twelfth Night, The Merchant of Venice, The Tempest.

These additional plays have come to hand since those formerly noticed in the *Review and Expositor* were received. The publishers lay the student world and the literary world under renewed obligations in bringing out this admirable edition of the immortal dramas in this eminently satisfactory dress. The new edition is a masterpiece of both the critic's and the publisher's skill—pleasant to the eye, easy to the hand, with brief but enlightening comment. Handling the books is a definite suggestion of postponed joy, and a present and imperious temptation to a busy man to let other things go and sit down and have a good time.

E. C. Dargan.

How the United States Became a Nation.

By John Fiske. Ginn & Co. Boston. 1904.

This little book takes up the history of our country with the beginning of Washington's administration, and traces the history of the government down to the end of the Civil War. This is the period of its making. The book is not a history of the country or its people, but a masterly sketch of the history of the government. It is probable that no American historian has had the ability of Fiske in this line of work. This little book is in his best vein.

W. J. McGlothlin.

The Face Beyond the Door.

By Coulson Kernahan. New York. A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1904, Pages 110. Price 40 cts.

Mr. Kernahan is the famous author of "God and the Ant" and "The Child, the Wise Man and the Devil," books which had a circulation of four hundred thousand. This little volume is an imaginative plea in behalf of the reality of the future life. There is wonderful sympathy in this brochure, and more than sympathy. There is the glow of a vital faith that can stand firm in the glow of modern research. It is a good book.

W. O. Carver.

A School History of England.

By Harmon B. Niver, A.B. The American Book Company. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1904. Pages 406. Price 90 cts.

This is a book for modern needs. There are an abundance of maps, a great variety of pictures, pertinent questions, subjects for further reading, a select bibliography, an excellent index, and a pronouncing dictionary. The work is well done, the style is bright and clear, and the child is enabled to grasp firmly the great movements in English history.

A New Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament.

By George Ricker Berry, Ph.D. Hinds & Noble. New York. 1897.

This is not a new book, but is a useful little dictionary to carry around with one to use in a hurry where one does not wish to go into the larger questions raised by Thayer or Liddell and Scott. There is a good list of New Testament synonyms in the appendix.

A. T. Robertson

A Short Treatise on Infant Baptism.

By Ervin F. Lyon, Th.M. Price 10 cents.

This little pamphlet of sixteen pages gives a good survey of the Baptist position on this subject and in good spirit. It is a useful tract and will do good.

Nameless Women of the Bible.

By Rev. Theron Brown, with Introduction by Mrs. Margaret E. Sangster. American Tract Society, New York. 1904.

This is a small volume of sixteen short essays on nameless women of the Bible, such as Pharoah's daughter, the mother of Samson, the queen of Sheba, the woman at Jacob's well, the widow with two mites, etc. The portraitures of Old Testament characters are good; those of New Testament women are better. Fancy fills in some of the Old Testament pictures, while Imagination holds the brush for the New Testament portraits. Especially glowing and lifelike are the pictures of the women who came in contact with the Lord. This book would be a welcome gift to any woman. John R. Sampey.

The Gateway Series of English Texts.

Edited by Henry Van Dyke. The American Book Company. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. Coleridge's The Rime of the Ancient Mariner. Professor George E. Woodberry, Columbia University. Carlyle's Essay on Burns. Professor Edwin Mims, Trinity College, North Carolina. Macaulay's Essay on Milton. Rev. E. L. Gulick, Master in the Lawrenceville (N.J.) School. Milton's Minor Poems. Professor Mary A. Jordan, Smith College. Skakespeare's Merchant of Venice. Professor Felix E. Schelling, University of Pennsylvania. Skakespeare's Macbeth. Professor Thomas M. Parrott, Princeton University. Tennyson's Idylls of the King. Henry Van Dyke. George Eliot's Silas Marner. Professor W. L. Cross, Yale University. Burke's Speech on Conciliation with America. Professor Wm. MacDonald, Brown University. The Sir Roger de Coverley Papers. Professor C. T. Winchester, Wesleyan University.

The Gateway Series of English Texts is designed for students of literature, especially as preparatory for college. The brief introduction by the general author, Dr. Van Dyke, states the matter better than one can restate it: "This series of books aims, first, to give the English texts required for entrance to college in a form which shall make them clear, interesting and helpful to those who are beginning the study of literature; and, second, to supply the knowledge which the student needs to pass the entrance examination. For these two reasons it is called *The Gateway Series*. The poems, plays, essays, and stories in these small volumes are treated, first of all, as works of literature, which were written to be read and enjoyed, not to be parsed and scanned and pulled to pieces. A short life of the author is given, and a portrait, in order to help the student to know the real person who wrote the book, and how it was written, and where the author got the idea, and what it means. The notes at the foot of the page are simply to give the sense of the hard words so that the student can read straight on without turning to a dictionary. The other notes, at the end of the book, explain difficulties and allusions and fine points. The editors are chosen because of their thorough training and fitness to deal with the books committed to them, and because they agree with this idea of what a Gateway Series ought to be. They express, in each case, their own views of the books which they edit. Simplicity, thoroughness, shortness, and clearness—these, we hope, will be the marks of the series."

The execution certainly bears out this promise. It

would be difficult to find a series of edited classics which more perfectly answers its announced purpose. Take, for example, Prof. MacDonald's admirable presentation of that masterpiece of Burke—the Speech on Conciliation with America. There is brief but clear account of the Colonies and the Mother Country at this crisis, then a rapid sketch of the early life of Burke, then a more detailed account of the great speech itself and how it came to be delivered, and lastly a short survey of Burke's closing years. Just enough biography to put the student in possession of the main facts. The notes really do enlighten and not clog; they help and do not distract. As for the oration itself—well, to reread it after long years in this fine dress is a delight indeed. The varied style, animated, appropriate, vigorous; the close reasoning, luminous statement, power of expression; the deep moral sincerity and patriotism, the profound insight, the lofty principles, the wealth of learning, the thorough preparation, and the noble modesty of the man, all mark the speech as one of the immortal masterpieces of political oratory. Many readers, who would be repelled from the study of Burke by the extent of his work as a whole, might well be tempted by this excellent presentation of one of the most important and noblest speeches to give at least as much study to him as would be requisite to the reading of this delightful little book.

In Professor Winchester's able and pleasing rendering of the papers from the *Spectator* which show forth the portrait of Sir Roger de Coverley, the general plan of the series finds another excellent fulfillment. The genial and innocent old knight charms us afresh with his native gentility, his unworldly yet shrewd opinions, his goodness of heart and his harmless foibles. The style of Steele and Addison, though not that of to-day, cannot be spared from our literary teaching—no longer indeed as a model, but as an example and suggestion. Happy are our youthful aspirants for literary culture in having all these masterpieces of the English classics put into their hands in such guise. And those of us who are no longer youthful students may find pleasure and profit in following the good guidance of these editors in reading these classics again.

E. C. Dargan.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

W. M. Ramsay, Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York. 1905.

Stimson, The Right Life and How to Live It. A. S. Barnes & Co., New York. 1905. Price, $1.20 net.

Sanday, Outlines of the Life of Christ. Scribners, New York. 1905. Price, $1.25 net.

Dixon, The Clansman. Doubleday, Page & Co., New York. 1905. Price $1.50.

Campbell, Sermons Addressed to Individuals. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York. 1905. $1.25. Pages, 328.

King, Religious Liberty. Preston & Rounds Co., Providence, R. I. 1903.

Johnson, The Holy Spirit Then and Now. American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia. 1904. Price $1.00 net.

Bryce, The Holy Roman Empire. New Edition. Macmillan & Co., New York. 1904. Price $1.50 net. Pages, 575.

Means, St. Paul and the Nicene Church. A. & C. Black, London. 1903. Pages, 349.

Knight, The Master's Questions. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York. 1904. Pages, 367.

Knox, Ready Money. Personal Help Publishing Co., Des Moines, Ia. 1905.

Beitraege zur Weiterentwicklung der Christlichen Religion. Herausgegeben von Prof. Deissmann, Dorner, Eucken, Gunkel, Herrmann, Meyer, Rein, Schroeder, Traub, Wobbermin. Muenchen, Germany. 1905. J. F. Lehman's Verlag. Pr. M. 5. To be had also from Lemcke & Buechner, New York.

Martin. Sphan, Leo XIII. Muenchen, Germany. Verlag Kirchheim. 1905. Pr. M. 5. To be had also from Lemcke and Buechner, New York.

Harper, The Priestly Element in the Old Testament. University of Chicago Press. New enlarged edition. 1905. Price $1.00.

Harper ,Amos and Hosea. International and Critical Commentary. Scribners, New York. $3.00 net.

Porter, The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers. Scribners, New York. 1905. $1.25 net.

Ellis, The Young People's Imitation of Christ. Griffiths & Rowland Press, Philadelphia. 1905.

Mackintosh, A First Primer of Apologetics. Andrew Melrose, London, England. 1904. Second ed. 1904. Price, 2s.